

Historic, Archive Document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.



H. R. 3480

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FEBRUARY 25, 1953

Mr. HOPE introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture

A BILL

To amend section 509 of title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, to extend for three years the period during which agricultural workers may be made available for employment under such title.

- 1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That section 509 of title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949,
4 as amended, is amended by striking out "December 31,
5 1953" and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1956".

83^d CONGRESS
1ST Session

H. R. 3480

A BILL

To amend section 509 of title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, to extend for three years the period during which agricultural workers may be made available for employment under such title.

By Mr. HOPE

FEBRUARY 25, 1953

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture

S. 1207

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

MARCH 6, 1953

Mr. AIKEN introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

A BILL

To amend section 509 of title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, to extend for three years the period during which agricultural workers may be made available for employment under such title.

- 1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That section 509 of title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949,
4 as amended, is amended by striking out "December 31,
5 1953" and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1956".

A BILL

To amend section 509 of title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, to extend for three years the period during which agricultural workers may be made available for employment under such title.

By Mr. AIKEN

MARCH 6, 1953

Read twice and referred to the Committee on
Agriculture and Forestry

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued April 1, 1953
For actions of March 31, 1953
83rd-1st, No. 55

CONTENTS

Cotton.....12	Lands, submerged.....2	Reorganization.....4
Daylight saving time...3,6	Loans, farm.....4	Research.....10
Electrification.....5	Personnel.....7	River development.....5
Farm policy.....13	Price supports.....13	Trade, foreign.....8
Flood control.....9	Reclamation.....5	Water rights.....11
Labor, farm.....1		

HIGHLIGHTS: House committee reported bill to continue Mexican farm labor program. Rep. Hope introduced bill to reorganize FCA.

HOUSE

1. FARM LABOR. The Agriculture Committee reported without amendment H. R. 3480, to continue the Mexican farm labor program for three years (H. Rept. 229)(p. 2682).
2. SUBMERGED LANDS. Continued debate on H. R. 4198, to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries, etc. (pp. 2639-79).

SENATE

3. DAYLIGHT SAVING TIME. The D. C. Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) S. 1419, to permit the D. C. Commissioners to establish daylight saving time in D. C. (p. D219).

BILLS INTRODUCED

4. FARM CREDIT; REORGANIZATION. H. R. 5353, by Rep. Hope, to increase farmer participation in ownership and control of the Federal farm credit system; to create a Federal Farm Credit Board; to abolish certain offices; to impose a franchise tax upon certain farm credit institutions; to Agriculture Committee (p. 2682). The "Daily Digest" states: "Chairman Hope announced that he introduced a farm-sponsored bill today...to reorganize the Farm Credit Administration and place its control under a 13-member Board. He stated that the purpose of the bill is to set up an entirely new administrative structure for directing the activities of the Farm Credit Administration, and to increase farmer participation in the ownership and control of the farm credit system." (p. D221.)
5. RIVER DEVELOPMENT. H. R. 4351, to authorize works of improvement on the Niagara River; to Public Works Committee (p. 2682).
H. R. 4368, authorizing works at Bridge Canyon, Colorado River; to Interior and Insular Affairs Committee(p. 2683).
6. DAYLIGHT SAVING TIME. H. R. 4363, by Rep. Broyhill, to authorize the President

to establish daylight saving time each year in D. C.; to D. C. Committee (p. 2682).

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

7. PERSONNEL. Rep. Wilson, Calif., inserted a newspaper editorial praising the President's program to improve civil service and his appointment of Philip Young as Chairman of CSC (p. A1782).
8. FOREIGN TRADE. Rep. Meader inserted a newspaper editorial favoring his bill, H. R. 4199, establishing a Commission on Overseas Investment and Trade (pp. A1785-6).
9. FLOOD CONTROL. Rep. Miller, Kans., inserted a Kans. Legislature resolution opposing Tuttle Creek Dam (p. A1786).
10. RESEARCH. Rep. Elliott inserted Dr. Waterman's recent speech explaining the program and policies of the National Science Foundation (pp. A1790-2).
11. WATER RIGHTS. Rep. Yerty inserted a Los Angeles Times article quoting a Calif. legislative committee as denouncing "the attempt of the United States...to claim the water of private owners in the Fallbrook area" (pp. 1797-8).
12. COTTON. Extension of remarks of Rep. Hagen, Calif., criticizing several large corporations for their methods of financing and purchasing cotton in the San Joaquin Valley (pp. A1799-1800).
13. FARM POLICY. Rep. Hope inserted his speech before the Commodity Club of N. Y. on the importance of agricultural policy, discussing the changing nature of agriculture, and favoring continuation and improvement of price supports (pp. A1802-4).

COMMITTEE HEARING ANNOUNCEMENTS FOR APR. 1: Controls legislation, including dairy-products imports, S. Banking and Currency (USDA testimony). Mexican farm labor program, S. Agriculture (exec). Alaska possessory claims, H. Interior and Insular Affairs. Newsprint supply, H. Interstate and Foreign Commerce (Mason, FS, to testify). Dairy problems, H. Agriculture. Lump-sum leave payments to major officials, H. Post Office and Civil Service. Foreign economic policy, H. Foreign Affairs. Agricultural appropriations for 1954, H. Appropriations (exec).

For supplemental information and copies of legislative material referred to, call Ext. 4654 or send to Room 105A.

IMPORTATION OF FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL WORKERS

MARCH 31, 1953.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. HOPE, from the Committee on Agriculture, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H. R. 3480]

The Committee on Agriculture, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 3480) to amend section 509 of title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949 to extend for 3 years the period during which agricultural workers may be made available for employment under such title, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

STATEMENT

The purpose is to continue for 3 years beyond December 31, 1953, the authority in Public Law 78 (82d Cong., 1st sess.) for recruitment and employment of agricultural workers from the Republic of Mexico, when an adequate number of workers are not available from the domestic labor force, to assist in growing, harvesting, and preparing for consumption, of crops grown in the United States.

The bill is of interest not only to the farmer employing such labor but also to consumers, for its objective is to assure abundant food and fiber for national defense and for all civilian needs. This labor is used in the production and harvest of fruits and vegetables, cotton, and sugarbeets. If there is insufficient labor to tend and harvest the fruit and vegetable crops, causing any shortage or disruption of movement to market, the impact will be felt immediately by consumers in higher prices for fruits and vegetables. A stabilized economy requires that these agricultural commodities be delivered to markets in sufficient volume to maintain stability of supply and price.

To this purpose, the Mexican migrant-labor program gives the Secretary of Labor authority to—

1. Determine the need for supplemental agricultural employment in the United States.

2. Ascertain that employment of Mexican nationals will not adversely affect wages or working conditions for United States workers.

3. Recruit workers in Mexico with assistance from the Mexican Government.

4. Transport selected workers to reception centers in the United States.

5. Assist in contracting them to farm employers in the United States.

6. Guarantee the performance of employers in meeting certain responsibilities imposed by an agreement between the two Governments.

During 1952 over 9 million placements of domestic agricultural workers were made by the local State employment-service officers. The Department of Labor undertook a variety of programs to make maximum use of domestic labor, including day hauls, farm clinics to bring together farm employers and workers, and a program to bring together farm operators and prospective tenants. Special efforts were made to place American Indians and to contract Puerto Ricans. But, despite these and other activities intended to make the most effective use of domestic labor, it was found necessary to contract 197,000 Mexican workers during 1952.

Your committee was advised by persons dealing directly with the problem that, in the absence of unforeseen circumstances drastically affecting the labor market, the need to augment the domestic agricultural labor force will not lessen materially in the foreseeable future. In the years of the greatest increases in agricultural production, to meet the growing defense and civilian demands, the supply of available domestic farmworkers has dwindled. Farm employment averaged 11 million in the years from 1946 to 1949. In 1951 the average had declined to 10 million, and in 1952 to 9,800,000. This decline has been brought about largely by the attraction of higher paying nonagricultural employment and by military manpower requirements. And experience shows that many veterans with agricultural experience do not return to farmwork.

The antecedents of your committee's bill reach back to World War II, when the need for farm labor became so acute that it necessitated establishment of an emergency farm-labor-supply program, under which the Department of Agriculture through the Extension Service employed workers from the British West Indies and Mexico. Moreover, relatively large numbers of prisoners of war were utilized in agricultural employment. The emergency farm-labor-supply program was terminated in 1947 and the farm-placement functions of the United States Employment Service of the Department of Labor again became operative.

The end of the emergency program of World War II was not attended by any marked abatement of the need for the foreign recruitment of farmworkers. The principal sources of such workers have been the Republic of Mexico, Canada, and the British West Indies. Workers also have been recruited in Puerto Rico for work in the continental United States.

To facilitate the orderly recruitment and employment of Mexican agricultural workers for temporary employment in the United States, Congress enacted Public Law 78 in 1951.

The spokesmen for farmer employers of this labor and representatives of the Department of Labor and the Department of Agriculture have appeared before your committee in public hearings and urged a continuation of this legislation.

Various opinions were presented at these hearings on whether the authority of Public Law 78 should be extended for 1 year, a few years, or whether the authority should be made permanent. The Department of Labor urged only a 1-year extension, giving its judgment that this might aid negotiations for a better working agreement with the Republic of Mexico in the joint operation of the recruitment program. On the other hand, spokesmen for large segments of farmer employers asked that the authority be made permanent, so that farm operators might plan their crops from year to year with full assurance that an ample labor supply will be available to tend and harvest them.

CONCLUSIONS

It is the judgment of the committee that Congress should extend the authority of Public Law 78 to December 31, 1956.

The committee is persuaded that this 3-year extension is essential to remove uncertainties of farm-labor supply and outweighs any consideration of a shorter extension.

Immediate action is needed to facilitate the necessary budgetary arrangements and appropriations essential to the operation of the program which, without this action, would expire December 31, 1953, at the midpoint of the next fiscal year. In the absence of the continuing authority, Congress can supply funds for only one-half the next fiscal year and some additional moneys for liquidation of the program. Early action on H. R. 3480 will enable Congress to respond to the program's budgetary needs.

Your committee urges prompt passage of H. R. 3480 in the interest of maintaining stability of supply and price of the food needs for civilian use and for national defense.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with clause 3 rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, changes made by the bill are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets; new matter is printed in italic; existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

[PUBLIC LAW 78—82D CONGRESS]

[CHAPTER 223—1ST SESSION]

[S. 984]

AN ACT To amend the Agricultural Act of 1949

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Agricultural Act of 1949 is amended by adding at the end thereof a new title to read as follows:

"TITLE V—AGRICULTURAL WORKERS

"SEC. 501. For the purpose of assisting in such production of agricultural commodities and products as the Secretary of Agriculture deems necessary, by supplying agricultural workers from the Republic of Mexico (pursuant to arrangements between the United States and the Republic of Mexico), the Secretary of Labor is authorized—

"(1) to recruit such workers (including any such workers who have resided in the United States for the preceding five years, or who are temporarily in the United States under legal entry);

"(2) to establish and operate reception centers at or near the places of actual entry of such workers into the continental United States for the purpose of receiving and housing such workers while arrangements are being made for their employment in, or departure from, the continental United States;

"(3) to provide transportation for such workers from recruitment centers outside the continental United States to such reception centers and transportation from such reception centers to such recruitment centers after termination of employment;

"(4) to provide such workers with such subsistence, emergency medical care, and burial expenses (not exceeding \$150 burial expenses in any one case) as may be or become necessary during transportation authorized by paragraph (3) and while such workers are at reception centers;

"(5) to assist such workers and employers in negotiating contracts for agricultural employment (such workers being free to accept or decline agricultural employment with any eligible employer and to choose the type of agricultural employment they desire, and eligible employers being free to offer agricultural employment to any workers of their choice not under contract to other employers);

"(6) to guarantee the performance by employers of provisions of such contracts relating to the payment of wages or the furnishing of transportation.

"SEC. 502. No workers shall be made available under this title to any employer unless such employer enters into an agreement with the United States—

"(1) to indemnify the United States against loss by reason of its guaranty of such employer's contracts;

"(2) to reimburse the United States for essential expenses, not including salaries or expenses of regular department or agency personnel, incurred by it for the transportation and subsistence of workers under this title in amounts not to exceed \$15 per worker; and

"(3) to pay to the United States, in any case in which a worker is not returned to the reception center in accordance with the contract entered into under section 501 (5), an amount determined by the Secretary of Labor to be equivalent to the normal cost to the employer of returning other workers from the place of employment to such reception center, less any portion thereof required to be paid by other employers.

"SEC. 503. No workers recruited under this title shall be available for employment in any area unless the Secretary of Labor has determined and certified that (1) sufficient domestic workers who are able, willing, and qualified are not available at the time and place needed to perform the work for which such workers are to be employed, (2) the employment of such workers will not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of domestic agricultural workers similarly employed, and (3) reasonable efforts have been made to attract domestic workers for such employment at wages and standard hours of work comparable to those offered to foreign workers.

"SEC. 504. Workers recruited under this title who are not citizens of the United States shall be admitted to the United States subject to the immigration laws (or if already in, for not less than the preceding five years or by virtue of legal entry, and otherwise eligible for admission to, the United States may, pursuant to arrangements between the United States and the Republic of Mexico, be permitted to remain therein) for such time and under such conditions as may be specified by the Attorney General but, notwithstanding any other provision of law or regulation, no penalty bond shall be required which imposes liability upon any person for the failure of any such worker to depart from the United States upon termination of employment: *Provided*, That no workers shall be made available under this title to, nor shall any workers made available under this title be permitted to remain in the employ of, any employer who has in his employ any Mexican alien when such employer knows or has reasonable grounds to believe or suspect or by reasonable inquiry could have ascertained that such Mexican alien is not lawfully within the United States.

"SEC. 505. (a) Section 210 (a) (1) of the Social Security Act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subparagraph as follows:

"(C) Service performed by foreign agricultural workers under contracts entered into in accordance with title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended."

“(b) Section 1426 (b) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subparagraph as follows:

“(C) Service performed by foreign agricultural workers under contracts entered into in accordance with title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended.”

“(c) Workers recruited under the provisions of this title shall not be subject to the head tax levied under section 2 of the Immigration Act of 1917 (8 U. S. C., sec. 132).

“SEC. 506. For the purposes of this title, the Secretary of Labor is authorized—

“(1) to enter into agreements with Federal and State agencies; to utilize (pursuant to such agreements) the facilities and services of such agencies; and to allocate or transfer funds or otherwise to pay or reimburse such agencies for expenses in connection therewith;

“(2) to accept and utilize voluntary and uncompensated services; and

“(3) when necessary to supplement the domestic agricultural labor force, to cooperate with the Secretary of State in negotiating and carrying out agreements or arrangements relating to the employment in the United States, subject to the immigration laws, of agricultural workers from the Republic of Mexico.

“SEC. 507. For the purposes of this title—

“(1) The term ‘agricultural employment’ includes services or activities included within the provisions of section 3 (f) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, or section 1426 (h) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, horticultural employment, cotton ginning, compressing and storing, crushing of oil seeds, and the packing, canning, freezing, drying, or other processing of perishable or seasonable agricultural products.

“(2) The term ‘employer’ shall include an association, or other group, of employers, but only if (A) those of its members for whom workers are being obtained are bound, in the event of its default, to carry out the obligations undertaken by it pursuant to section 502, or (B) the Secretary determines that such individual liability is not necessary to assure performance of such obligations.

“SEC. 508. Nothing in this Act shall be construed as limiting the authority of the Attorney General, pursuant to the general immigration laws, to permit the importation of aliens of any nationality for agricultural employment as defined in section 507, or to permit any such alien who entered the United States legally to remain for the purpose of engaging in such agricultural employment under such conditions and for such time as he, the Attorney General, shall specify.

“SEC. 509. No workers will be made available under this title for employment after [December 31, 1953] *December 31, 1956.*”



Union Calendar No. 65

83^D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 3480

[Report No. 229]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FEBRUARY 25, 1953

Mr. HOPE introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture

MARCH 31, 1953

Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union
and ordered to be printed

A BILL

To amend section 509 of title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, to extend for three years the period during which agricultural workers may be made available for employment under such title.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That section 509 of title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949,
4 as amended, is amended by striking out "December 31,
5 1953" and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1956".

I

Union Calendar No. 65

83^d CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 3480

[Report No. 229]

A BILL

To amend section 509 of title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, to extend for three years the period during which agricultural workers may be made available for employment under such title.

By Mr. Hope

FEBRUARY 25, 1953

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture

MARCH 31, 1953

Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued April 15, 1953
For actions of April 14, 1953
83rd-1st, No. 64

CONTENTS

Appropriations.....23	Foreign aid.....21	Rubber.....6
Budgeting.....20	Investigations.....7	St. Lawrence seaway.....18
Dairy problems.....16	Labor, farm.....4	TVA.....13
Electrification.....3,10,17	Lands, public.....1	Trade agreements.....9
Extension Service.....5	Personnel.....12	Trade, foreign.....9,19
Farm policy.....14,22	Purchasing.....11	Transportation.....2
Flood control.....17	Reclamation.....8	Wheat agreement.....15

HIGHLIGHTS: House adopted resolution for consideration of Mexican farm labor bill. House committee reported resolution authorizing Agriculture Committee to conduct investigations, etc. House received proposed bill to consolidate Extension Service authorizations. Rep. Burdick criticized Secretary on price supports and production controls.

SENATE

1. SUBMERGED LANDS. Continued debate on S. J. Res. 13, to establish State title to submerged lands (pp. 3135-64).
2. TRANSPORTATION. The D. C. Committee reported with amendment S. 922, to provide for a commission to regulate the public transportation of passengers in D. C. (S. Rept. 141)(p. 3165).
3. ELECTRIFICATION. Sen. Humphrey inserted his letter to Ancher Nelsen urging "vigorous support against efforts to cripple or curtail REA activities" (pp. 3188-9).

HOUSE

4. FARM LABOR. Adopted a resolution making in order the consideration of H. R. 3480, to extend the Mexican farm labor program for 3 years (pp. 3196, 3203-4).
5. EXTENSION SERVICE. Received from this Department a proposed bill to consolidate Extension Service authorizations; to Agriculture Committee (p. 3204).
6. RUBBER. Both Houses received the President's message recommending sale to private industry of Government rubber facilities (H. Doc. 123)(pp. 3190-1, 3193).
7. INVESTIGATIONS. The Rules Committee reported with amendment H. Res. 161, authorizing the Agriculture Committee to conduct studies and investigations and granting it subpoena power (H. Rept. 263)(p. 3196). The "Daily Digest" states that the amendment limits the studies to within U. S. boundaries (p. D264).

BILLS INTRODUCED

8. RECLAMATION. S. 1628, by Sen. Knowland, to provide for loans to water-users organizations of the cost of construction of distribution systems for use of water available from Federal reclamation projects; to Interior and Insular

Affairs Committee (pp. 3165-6).

H. R. 4551, by Rep. Poulson, to amend the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 removing authorization of projects by the Secretary of the Interior; to Interior and Insular Affairs Committee (p. 3205). Remarks of author (p. 3195).

H. R. 4542, by Rep. Hyde, and

9. TRADE AGREEMENTS. /H. R. 4533, by Rep. Ayres, to extend the authority for reciprocal trade agreements; to Ways and Means Committee (p. 3205).

10. ELECTRIFICATION. H. R. 4541, by Rep. Ellsworth, to provide for additional electric-power development on the Columbia River; to Public Works Committee (p. 3205).

11. PURCHASING. H. R. 4545, to promote the efficient and economical functioning of the executive branch by providing for a central purchasing agency; to Government Operations Committee (p. 3205). Remarks of author (p. 3195).

12. PERSONNEL. H. R. 4555, by Rep. Withrow, to amend the Classification Act of 1949; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee (p. 3205).

H. R. 4556, by Rep. Withrow, to increase the pay of certain Government employees; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee (p. 3205).

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

13. TVA. Sen. Sparkman inserted a newspaper editorial stating Interior Secretary McKay feels the TVA "has been doing a good job and he opposes suggestions that TVA be sold to private business" (pp. A1967-8).

Sen. Sparkman inserted a newspaper editorial opposing Congress' taking part in the administrative affairs of TVA (p. A1987).

14. FARM POLICY. Extension of remarks by Rep. Burdick favoring crop surpluses and price supports, and saying "Benson will be doing a disservice...if he follows a program of scarcity instead of a program of plenty" (p. A1969).

15. WHEAT AGREEMENT. Rep. Ostertag inserted a New York Times article criticizing the International Wheat Agreement (pp. A1969-70).

16. DAIRY PROBLEMS. Rep. Marshall inserted 4 recommendations by Oscar Lauterbach, President, North American Dairy Cattle Research Foundation, to help the dairy industry (p. A1974).

17. FLOOD CONTROL; ELECTRIFICATION. Sen. Mansfield inserted a series of radio broadcasts outlining the benefits to accrue from the proposed Libby Dam, Mont. (pp. A1981-4).

18. ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY. Sen. Wiley inserted several newspaper editorials favoring joint construction of this project by the U. S. and Canada (pp. A1991-2).

19. FOREIGN TRADE. Rep. Smith, Miss., inserted a Progressive Farmer article, "Europe Now Needs Trade, Less Aid," opposing raising U. S. tariffs on Europe's products (pp. A1997-8).

20. BUDGETING. Rep. Phillips inserted a Reader's Digest article, "Congress Can Stop Government Waste," which advocates bringing the GAO into the appropriations process to aid Congress (pp. A2004-5).

CONSIDERATION OF H. R. 3480

APRIL 14, 1953.—Referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H. Res. 204]

The Committee on Rules, having had under consideration House Resolution 204, report the same to the House with the recommendation that the resolution do pass.



House Calendar No. 27

83^D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. RES. 204

[Report No. 264]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

APRIL 14, 1953

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following resolution; which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed

RESOLUTION

1 *Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it
2 shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into
3 the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the
4 Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3480) to
5 amend section 509 of title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949,
6 to extend for three years the period during which agricultural
7 workers may be made available for employment under such
8 title. After general debate, which shall be confined to the
9 bill, and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally
10 divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority
11 member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be
12 read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the con-

1 clusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the
2 Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with
3 such amendments as may have been adopted, and the pre-
4 vious question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and
5 amendments thereto to final passage without intervening mo-
6 tion except one motion to recommit.

House Calendar No. 27

83d CONGRESS
1st Session

H. RES. 204

[Report No. 264]

RESOLUTION

Providing for the consideration of H. R. 3480,
a bill to amend section 509 of title V of the
Agricultural Act of 1949, to extend for three
years the period during which agricultural
workers may be made available for employ-
ment under such title.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio

APRIL 14, 1953

Referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be
printed

These favorable conditions offer hope that the point 4 and other cooperative programs will succeed and will offer valuable demonstrations for other countries. The Costa Ricans do not regard point 4 funds as hand-outs and are supplying the major share of all project costs. American officials expect the early reduction and ultimate elimination of our part of the program. Our son-in-law, William E. Bell, is engaged in sanitary engineering for the joint government services.

Several American churches have missions in the rural areas. I talked with a young Methodist missionary in a village so remote from highways and railroads that she must ride horseback several hours to reach it.

News from America is available through newspapers brought in by air. I have been able to get fairly complete reports of General Eisenhower's trip to Korea and am looking forward to his recommendations and decisions regarding our future course in the war.

We will be back in Washington on December 18 and I will begin my preparations for the 83d Congress. It will be a historical session.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECLAMATION PROJECTS

(Mr. POULSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced legislation which will remove the present authorization giving the Secretary of the Interior the power to authorize reclamation projects by making a finding of feasibility and sending a report to the Congress. This power was originally included in section 9 (a) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939. I am sure that when it was passed the Members of Congress did not realize the extent of dissipation of legitimate congressional power that would result from this tiny hole in the dike.

To the dismay of many of us, this innocent-looking provision was used by former Secretary Chapman to authorize a project in excess of \$200 million without further hearings by any congressional committee. Surely, that was not the intent of the original legislation.

With mounting defense costs and the need for even more critical review of any Federal expenditures, it is only reasonable that we should remove this provision from the reclamation law. I believe every Member of this body will concur that reclamation and other types of public projects should come before the Congress for thorough review and be authorized only by the elected representatives of the people.

Fortunately for us the present Secretary of the Interior, the Honorable Douglas McKay, has indicated to me and other members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs that he does not want this power. He prefers that the Congress make clear-cut authorizations so that he, in his executive capacity, can carry out the programs that are authorized by the Congress. This is just another step in the much needed revision of a Government that has grown unwieldy and unmanageable because a party has been too long in power. I be-

lieve that every conscientious public servant charged with the administration of reclamation projects will be pleased to have these lines of authority drawn more clearly so that they may proceed with the work assigned to them in the most efficient manner and without unnecessary criticism.

CENTRAL PURCHASING DEPARTMENT NEEDED FOR GOVERNMENT

(Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I am today filing a bill that would set up a single purchasing agency through which would funnel the hundreds of thousands of items that are needed to run all departments of the National Government.

My bill is aimed at the duplication and waste in our Defense Department, which eats up most of the Federal Budget, but it would cover all other agencies as well.

Unification of the Armed Forces was supposed to effect economies through improved administration, but there is no sign of this as yet. There are too many instances where the Army, Navy, and the Air Force, pay different prices for the same article. And each one calls this article by different names adding to the general confusion. While spending tens of billions of dollars, we are having difficulty in getting enough of that basic military commodity—ammunition—to support an operation that is played down as being a police action. To a lesser extent, the same criticism applies to other Federal agencies. We need a central purchasing department to bring order out of this chaos.

Under the terms of my bill, all purchases of supplies would be done through one agency. This office would also compile a catalog, or catalogs, standardizing all items by name, for the convenience of the Government and its suppliers.

We have been told that the new administration will be business-like, but I fail to see any application of the Sears, Roebuck or Montgomery Ward techniques to date. The Pentagon, in particular, is a thriving bureaucracy that will resist commonsense methods and economies to the last ditch. I firmly believe that the Congress should take a hand in this matter and pass streamlining legislation that will end this bidding by one agency against another which only results in boosting the final cost for the taxpayers; and that includes all of us today. Even the helpless infant in his crib is paying for the reckless rivalry among Government agencies. Uniform purchasing methods would help to cut down this extravagance and thereby ease the tax burden.

MALENKOV'S PEACE MOVES

(Mr. GATHINGS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, there is nothing new in the news that has been

coming from Moscow under the new Malenkov regime.

Although it is puzzling, to put it mildly, just what real intentions are back of these various peaceful maneuvers, even the most cynical observers of the many years of cold war struggle between the two fronts were seemingly optimistic to a degree that general conditions between the East and West had become appreciably improved. There can be little disagreement on the question of which side had been benefited in connection with the exchange of the sick and disabled prisoners' controversy. The Reds agreed to return 600 captives, and the United Nations forces are to deliver 5,800. The truth of the whole matter is that Malenkov is in trouble at home, as well as inside the satellite nations. He is anxious to consolidate his forces at home and desires to lull the West with his peace restoration propaganda. The goals of the Russians are unchanged: they wish to spread confusion in Europe, hatred of the United States throughout the world, to bring more Asians within the Soviet's sphere of influence, and to rule the world. In the past, the Communists have found that peace talks offer the best medium to consolidate and build up their military strength. Such talks are a forerunner—or a stage setting—to foment new troubles in some other part of the world. It would be well for the American people to bear in mind that the United States cannot let down its guard, be lulled and appeased, by the happenings of recent weeks.

Here are some of the happenings of the last few days:

March 19, 1953, marked the first overture on the part of Russian leadership that the Communists were changing their tactics in dealing with the other nations of the world. On March 19, Gen. Vassily I. Chuikov, Russian commander in Berlin, expressed regrets over the shooting down, a short time before, of a British plane. Since that date the Russians have arranged to release British civilians that had been interned for many months in North Korea; they have arranged the return of some 2,000 Japanese that had been stranded in China after World War II; they have permitted American newsmen to obtain visas to enter Moscow; they have accepted Gen. Mark Clark's offer to exchange sick and wounded prisoners of war; and, Red Chinese Premier Chou En-lai agreed to abandon the Red stand on forced repatriation of all prisoners; they have agreed to accept Dag Hammarskjöld of Sweden as successor to Trygve Lie; have proposed a four-power discussion on German unity and peace; have announced sharp cuts in prices of foods and various forms of merchandise inside the Soviet Union. Malenkov has pledged Russian support for an armistice in Korea. The Soviets agreed to discuss armed production and atomic control, disregarding its former disarmament proposal in the United Nations. Other gestures have been made by the Russians including the release of nine doctors, who had been held captive since January 13, for questioning in the death of certain Red leaders. Furthermore,

amnesty was granted to a large number of Soviet convicts.

Malenkov and Beria seem to be engaged in a bitter feud in an effort to show the Russian masses which offer the better hope for that Nation's future destiny. In any event, the peace moves have been intended to do three things:

First. To improve the internal conditions within the Soviet Union.

Second. To create disunity and pandemonium among the nations of Western Europe.

Third. To force the reduction of military and foreign-aid spending by the United States.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. PFOST asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes on Thursday, April 16, following the legislative program of the day and the conclusion of special orders heretofore granted.

H. R. 1, TAX REDUCTION BILL

(Mr. MASON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, there is a discharge petition on the desk. It was placed there yesterday by the gentleman from New York, Mr. DAN REED. Its object is to bring before this House the tax-reduction bill known as H. R. 1 for prompt action.

I think the House should act promptly, even if the other body does not. I invite the Members on both sides of the aisle who indicated in the campaign that they would be for tax reduction this year to sign that petition so that we can at least get a chance to vote upon it.

AUTHORIZING THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE TO MAKE INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 161, Rept. No. 263), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That the Committee on Agriculture, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to conduct studies, investigations, and to inquire into any matter within its jurisdiction, including but not limited to the study of long-range problems affecting agriculture and forestry. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to make such inspections or investigations, to use such governmental facilities without reimbursement therefor, and to require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses, and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee, or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any

member thereof may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses.

That the said committee shall issue such reports, including reports to the House of Representatives, with such recommendations for legislation or otherwise as the committee deems desirable.

TO AMEND SECTION 509 OF TITLE V OF THE AGRICULTURAL ACT

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 204, Rept. No. 264), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3480) to amend section 509 of title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, to extend for 3 years the period during which agricultural workers may be made available for employment under such title. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

TO AMEND SECTION 5210 OF THE REVISED STATUTES

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 205, Rept. No. 265) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4004) to amend section 5210 of the Revised Statutes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the amendment recommended by the Committee on Banking and Currency now in the bill. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the calendar.

MRS. JENNIE MAURELLO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 778) for the relief of Mrs. Jennie Maurello.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

LT. THOMAS C. ROONEY AND MRS. THOMAS C. ROONEY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 814) for the relief of Lt. Thomas C. Rooney and Mrs. Thomas C. Rooney, his wife.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$10,000 to Lt. Thomas C. Rooney and Mrs. Thomas C. Rooney, his wife, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the loss of their minor son, Daniel J. Rooney, who was killed as the result of an accident in Government Quarters Building 19, Apartment 2, Atterberry Area, Frankfurt Main, Germany, on September 11, 1950. The claim of the said Lt. Thomas C. Rooney and his wife, Mrs. Thomas C. Rooney, is not a claim which is cognizable under the Federal Tort Claims Act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "\$10,000" and insert "\$5,000."

Page 1, line 7, after the word "wife," insert "of Mariposa Drive West, San Antonio, Tex."

Page 2, line 5, insert "Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUSAN KAY BURKHALTER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1456) for the relief of Susan Kay Burkhalter, a minor.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the legal guardian of Susan Kay Burkhalter, a minor, South Bend, Ind., the sum of \$10,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Susan Kay Burkhalter and of her legal guardian against the United States arising out of injuries, resulting in a hip scar deformity and a partial foot scar deformity, sustained by her on November 17, 1943, when she was accidentally burned by the heating element of her incubator at the family clinic, Naval Air Station, San Diego, Calif.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the minor child, Anna Bosco Lomonaco, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Antonio Lomonaco, citizens of the United States.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 3, strike out "4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended," and insert "101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PATRICIA ANN DUTCHESS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3244) for the relief of Patricia Ann Dutches.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Patricia Ann Dutches, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Don D. and Mary Ellen Dutches, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ERNA MEYER GRAFTON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3358) for the relief of Erna Meyer Grafton.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Erna Meyer Grafton may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice have knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GEORGE PROKOFIEFF DE SEVERSKY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3678) for the relief of George Prokofieff de Seversky and Isabelle Prokofieff de Seversky.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, George Prokofieff de Seversky and Isabelle Prokofieff de Seversky shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the

Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANTHONY LYNN NEIS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3724) for the relief of Anthony Lynn Neis.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of section 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Anthony Lynn Neis, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Adolph A. and Lois Marie Neis, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STAVRULA PERUTSEA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3753) for the relief of Stavrula Perutsea.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Stavrula Perutsea shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. This concludes the call of the Private Calendar.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order on Calendar Wednesday may be dispensed with tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF FARM LABOR ACT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order today to take up and consider the resolution just reported by the Rules Committee, making in order a bill providing for the extension of the Farm Labor Act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

HOOR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House

adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF FARM LABOR ACT

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution House Resolution 204, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3480) to amend section 509 of title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, to extend for 3 years the period during which agricultural workers may be made available for employment under such title. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, this rule makes in order the consideration of the bill H. R. 3480, reported by the Committee on Agriculture. The bill is a simple extension of a bill, passed at least twice by this House previously, for the purpose of providing agricultural labor to be brought into this country from other countries, particularly from Mexico, to relieve labor shortages in certain parts of our country.

The bill itself is very short and does nothing but strike out "December 31, 1953" and insert in lieu thereof "December 31, 1956."

Testimony from the Committee on Agriculture, as heard by the Committee on Rules, indicates that the program has worked with considerable success the last several years. The Committee on Agriculture also reported that there was no opposition to the bill or to the law or to an extension of the law by this bill.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I shall be happy to.

Mr. CELLER. I may say to the gentleman that there was a great deal of opposition to the basic act. This rule, of course, makes in order the consideration of a bill that simply extends the act for a period of 3 years, but there was considerable opposition expressed in the well of the House when the bill was initially considered. I am sure that opposition still exists and there would be considerable opposition to the basic principles enunciated in the original act.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Perhaps the gentleman did not quite understand my

statement. The statement made by the Committee on Agriculture to the Committee on Rules and which I repeated a moment ago was that the bill now before us, namely, the extension of the act, had brought forth no opposition before the committee; and I have not heard any.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. My understanding is that the Department of Agriculture asked that this be extended 1 year. Could not that be interpreted as opposition to a 3-year extension?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I would not think so. If it was good to extend it for 1 year I would assume it must be good to extend it for 3 years. As a matter of fact, I think it is true that the program has worked very well.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. I might say that it is not our purpose to undertake consideration of the bill today, but simply to adopt the rule so that consideration of the bill in general debate and reading under the 5-minute rule may be the first order of business tomorrow.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, there being no further requests for time on the rule, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDER TRANSFERRED

By unanimous consent, the special order granted to Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts to address the House for 10 minutes today was transferred to tomorrow, April 15, following any special orders heretofore entered.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts in two instances; to include in one an article from the National Tribune and in the other a letter and a statement by the American Legion.

Mr. SHEEHAN and to include an editorial.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska.

Mr. CANFIELD and to include an editorial.

Mr. AYRES.

Mr. BURDICK in two instances.

Mr. LANE in five instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PERKINS in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOWELL and to include a resolution in favor of universal military training by the New Jersey American Legion.

Mr. MATTHEWS and to include an article.

Mr. JONES of Alabama and to include an essay written by Miss Wynell Glanton, a high school student of Elkmont, Ala.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania in two instances, in one to include an article by Thomas L. Stokes which appeared in yesterday's Star.

Mr. PRICE in three instances, in each to include a newspaper article.

Mr. TEAGUE in three instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ALEXANDER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MARSHALL and to include a news item.

Mr. MORRISON and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. SHELLEY (at the request of Mr. MORRISON) in two instances in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BATTLE and to include a resolution and a letter.

Mr. MULTER in five instances in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana in two instances in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KING of California in three instances and to include an article by Mr. DEWEY SHORT before the National Rifle Association this month in Washington, and in another instance to extend his remarks with reference to a bill introduced by Mr. KING today.

Mr. KLEIN (at the request of Mr. PRICE) in four instances in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. OSTERTAG and to include an editorial.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 57 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 15, 1953, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

626. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a proposed bill entitled "A bill to repeal certain acts relating to cooperative agricultural extension work and to amend the Smith-Lever Act of May 8, 1914, to provide for cooperative agricultural extension work between the agricultural colleges in the several States, Territories, and possessions receiving the benefits of an act of Congress approved July 2, 1862, and of acts supplementary thereto, and the United States Department of Agriculture"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

627. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the Dependents' Assistance Act of 1950, as amended, so as to provide punishment for fraudulent acceptance of benefits thereunder"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

628. A letter from the General Counsel, Office of the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the sale of Army, Navy, and Air Force stores at military establishments to civilian employees of the Government, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

629. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of

Engineers, United States Army, dated January 23, 1953, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers on a review of report on the Potomac River and tributaries, with special reference to flood control on Happy Creek for Front Royal and vicinity in Virginia. This investigation was requested by a resolution of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted on July 5, 1946; to the Committee on Public Works.

630. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 23, 1953, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Allegheny River, up to Olean, N. Y., authorized by the River and Harbor Act, approved on March 2, 1945, and of Allegheny River and tributaries and Genesee River and tributaries, New York, and Pennsylvania, with a view to providing a through waterway for barge navigation, authorized by the River and Harbor Act, approved on May 17, 1950; to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BROWN of Ohio: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 161. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Agriculture to make investigations into any matter within its jurisdiction, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 263). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 204. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 3480, a bill to amend section 509 of title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, to extend for 3 years the period during which agricultural workers may be made available for employment under such title; without amendment (Rept. No. 264). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 205. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 4004, a bill to amend section 5210 of the Revised Statutes; without amendment (Rept. No. 265). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2113. A bill to amend the act incorporating the American Legion so as to redefine (a) the powers of said corporation, (b) the right to the use of the name "The American Legion" and "American Legion"; without amendment (Rept. No. 266). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2990. A bill to amend the act which incorporated the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States; with amendment (Rept. No. 267). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 3409. A bill to terminate Federal discriminations against the Indians of Montana; with amendment (Rept. No. 268). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 4483. A bill to provide compensation to the Shoshone and Arapahoe Tribes of Indians for certain lands of the Riverton reclamation project within the ceded portion of the Wind River Indian Reservation, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 269). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued April 16, 1953
For actions of April 15, 1953
83rd-1st, No. 65

CONTENTS

Appropriations.....18	Forestry.....15	Price supports.....19
Dairy products.....22	Information.....11	Reorganization.....27
Economic controls 10,20	Investigations.....2	Reports.....7
Electrification....6,21,23	Labor, farm.....1	River basin.....3,12
Expenditures.....29	Lands, submarginal.....14	St. Lawrence Seaway....21
Extension Service.....9	Lands, submerged.....8	Trade, foreign....5,15,25
Farm problems.....24	Mail.....13	Transportation.....25
Flood control.....3,12	Monopolies.....4,17	Treaties.....28

HIGHLIGHTS: House passed bill to continue Mexican farm labor program. Rep. Will inserted Secretary's Denver speech on farm problems.

HOUSE

1. FARM LABOR. Passed, 259-87, without amendment H. R. 3480, which continues for 3 years beyond Dec. 31, 1953, the authority for recruitment and employment of agricultural workers from Mexico, when an adequate number of workers are not available from the domestic labor force, to assist in growing, harvesting, and preparing for consumption, of crops grown in the U. S. (pp. 3260-75). Rejected, 50 to 114, an amendment by Rep. Bailey to continue the program for 1 year instead of 3 years (pp. 3271-3). An amendment by Rep. McCarthy, to specify a minimum wage for farm workers who are U. S. citizens, was ruled out of order (p. 3273).
2. INVESTIGATIONS. Agreed, as reported, to H. Res. 161, granting certain investigatory and subpoena powers to the Agriculture Committee (pp. 3235-6).
3. COLUMBIA RIVER. The Public Works Committee reported without amendment H. R. 4025, authorizing projects in the Columbia River Basin for flood control and other purposes (H. Rept. 270)(p. 3298).
4. MONOPOLIES. The Judiciary Committee reported without amendment H. R. 2237, to increase fines under the Sherman Anti-trust Act (H. Rept. 271)(p. 3298).
5. FOREIGN TRADE. Rep. Smith, Miss., spoke in favor of encouraging foreign trade and against high tariffs (pp. 3286-91).
6. ELECTRIFICATION. Rep. Jones, Ala., criticized a Farm Bureau recommendation for sale of Government generating plants and transmission lines and commended TVA (pp. 3295-7).
7. REPORTS. Received from this Department a report of obligations incurred in excess of amounts permitted by the administrative regulations, and from the Comptroller General a report on GAO work for the fiscal year 1952 (p. 3298).

SENATE

8. SUBMERGED LANDS. Continued debate on S. J. Res. 13, to establish State title to submerged lands (pp. 3221-58).
9. EXTENSION SERVICE. Received from this Department a proposed bill to consolidate Extension Service authorizations; to Agriculture and Forestry Committee (p. 3211).
10. ECONOMIC CONTROLS. Sen. Capehart received permission to submit a minority report (with Sens. Bricker, Bennett, and Goldwater) on S. 1081, providing authority for temporary economic controls (p. 3218).
11. INFORMATION. Sen. Daniels inserted his statement urging the President to revoke the executive order establishing a system of news censorship for all Federal agencies (pp. 3258-9).

BILLS INTRODUCED

12. COLUMBIA RIVER. S. 1633, by Sen. Martin, authorizing certain projects on the Columbia River for flood control and other purposes; to Public Works Committee (p. 3213).
13. MAIL. S. 1635, by Sen. Holland, to exempt State departments of agriculture and State marketing bureaus from the increase in postage rates on third-class mail in 1951; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee (p. 3213).
H. R. 4589, by Rep. Ford, to withdraw the privilege of free transmission of official mail matter from certain Government corporations and agencies; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee (p. 3298).
14. SUBMARGINAL LANDS. H. R. 4583, by Rep. Chatham, to amend Sec. 33 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act by striking out the sentence which restricts the use which a county may make of funds paid to it under that section; to Agriculture Committee (p. 3298).
15. FORESTRY. H. R. 4587, by Rep. Engle, to facilitate the development, maintenance, and operating facilities for public use in the national forests; to Agriculture Committee (p. 3298).
H. R. 4588, to provide for issuance of campfire permits and to facilitate the development, maintenance, and operating facilities for public use in the national forests; to Agriculture Committee (p. 3298).
16. TRADE AGREEMENTS. H. R. 4590, by Rep. Frelinghuysen, and H. R. 4594, by Rep. Keating, to extend the authority of the President to enter into reciprocal trade agreements; to Ways and Means Committee (pp. 3298-9).
17. MONOPOLIES. H. R. 4597, by Rep. Reed, Ill., to authorize treble damages in private actions under the antitrust laws; to Judiciary Committee (p. 3299).

COMMITTEE HEARINGS RELEASED BY G. P. O.

18. APPROPRIATIONS for Federal Security Agency, 1954, part 1. H. Appropriations.
19. PRICE SUPPORTS for 1952 Maryland tobacco, H. R. 1432. H. Agriculture.
20. ECONOMIC CONTROLS, part 3, S. 753 and S. 1081. S. Banking and Currency.

H. R. 3480

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

APRIL 16 (legislative day, APRIL 6), 1953

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

AN ACT

To amend section 509 of title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, to extend for three years the period during which agricultural workers may be made available for employment under such title.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That section 509 of title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949,
4 as amended, is amended by striking out "December 31,
5 1953" and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1956".

Passed the House of Representatives April 15, 1953.

Attest:

LYLE O. SNADER,

Clerk.

83^d CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 3480

AN ACT

To amend section 509 of title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, to extend for three years the period during which agricultural workers may be made available for employment under such title.

APRIL 16 (legislative day, APRIL 6), 1953
Read twice and referred to the Committee on
Agriculture and Forestry

Today I have written to President Eisenhower asking that he give careful consideration to revoking that Executive order issued by his predecessor.

I feel that such action by the present Chief Executive is advisable and important for these reasons:

1. The Executive order issued by former President Truman confers upon Federal officials unnecessarily broad authority to classify and restrict information without adequately defining the basis for such classification or prescribing the limits of information to be withheld.

2. The order is entirely negative in net effect; it fosters and even requires an attitude of secrecy on the part of executive officers without requiring or encouraging full and prompt disclosure of nonsecurity information.

3. The continuation of this Executive order in full effect can only serve to make secrecy a growing habit among the executive departments and agencies.

4. The national security requires the adoption of an executive policy encouraging full dissemination of information in which resort to classification of information will be the rare exception rather than the general rule.

A POTENTIAL DANGER

Executive Order 10290, as it now stands, constitutes a weapon of potential danger to the proper functioning of our system of representative government.

This was my conviction at the time the order was issued. It is my conviction still.

One year ago, when I began my campaign for the office I now hold, I stated as one of the fundamental principles of my campaign the following:

"To govern themselves, the people must have access to the truth without the censorship of nonmilitary information now imposed by Presidential order."

At that time, I pledged myself to work "to make sure that the people's business is transacted at all times out in the light of day, not under the censorship of official secrecy."

My deep concern about this matter—a concern not removed solely by changes at the White House—stems from personal experience. On the State level, it has been my privilege to serve as an official of the executive branch and of the legislative branch of State Government. Also, outside public service, I have been associated for nearly 25 years with the newspaper business, as a student, as a reporter, and, presently, as a co-publisher of two Texas weekly newspapers.

As a lawyer, as a public official, and as a newspaperman, I have seen the various sides of this question and from several practical vantage points.

A POWER EASILY ABUSED

Frankly, my anxiety over the existence of any executive censorship order arises more from my acquaintance with the powers and

prerogatives of executive officers in representative governments than from my experience in the newspaper field.

The executive presiding over an agency or department, large or small, on any level of government holds enormous power over the molding of public opinion. It is a power easily abused. Give an executive an order instructing him to withhold information and granting him unlimited discrimination to exercise that authority and you render abuses virtually inevitable.

THE OPPOSITION OF THE PRESS

At the time President Truman's order was issued, the threat of potential abuse was almost universally recognized by representatives of the press and radio.

One of the most effective comments was made by the New York Times editorially on September 28, 1951:

"Thomas Jefferson several times pointed out that the success of real government by consent depended primarily upon the enlightenment of the electorate. A policy that tends to dry up information at the source through the device of classification will work against that enlightenment. We do not want security information to come into the hands of our adversaries if it can be avoided. But we do want all sorts of information in the hands of our public all the time."

The Associated Press Managing Editors Association described Executive Order 10290 as a "dangerous instrument of news suppression."

The National Editorial Association, representing 5,400 weekly and small town newspapers, declared in a resolution:

"The editors feel that the restriction constitutes a most serious threat to the traditional accessibility to information which is inherent in the Bill of Rights."

The National Federation of Press Women asked for modification of the order "so that the public may be assured of access to information and news that does not endanger the security of this Nation."

The American Society of Newspaper Editors, which had protested the impending release of the President's order before it was issued, reaffirmed its opposition, stating:

"We feel that the net effect of this executive order will be to formalize the suppression of much news to which the public is entitled."

These fears and criticisms were valid and justified in 1951, and remain valid today.

FULL ACCESS TO NEWS IN TIME OF CHANGE

In a period of changing policy and changing directions for our Government, it was never more important that the people be assured full and free access to the vital information upon which these changes are predicated. The people and the officials who serve them must work from the same set of books. Executive Order 10290 enables officials to keep one set of books while the public is obliged to work from another.

Because this is possible, such an order should not be allowed to stand.

True, we must have safeguards against unauthorized disclosure of true security information. To protect ourselves against the threat of carelessness, we need not be careless with the rights of the people to other public information. To protect ourselves against the theft of security information, we should not steal the rights of the free press.

THE BASIS OF TRUE SECURITY

Our national security is not a collection of data stored in metal files, as President Truman's order implies. Our real security lies in the wise decisions of a fully informed public.

No censor's pencil can draw a blueprint for national strength. To the extent that the people are informed, to that extent we are strong. While we may rightfully fear unauthorized disclosures of information affecting our national security, we have more to fear from unwarranted concealment of information by our own Government.

It is my opinion that security information which should be kept secret from our enemies can be protected by classification orders without denying our own people public information concerning the affairs of their own Government.

Because President Eisenhower has demonstrated his disapproval of censorship and other limitations on information concerning the people's business, it is my hope that he will give careful consideration to revoking Executive Order 10290.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of my letter to the President be included in the RECORD.

RECESS

Mr. TAFT. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 17 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, April 16, 1953, at 11 o'clock a. m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 15 (legislative day of April 6), 1953:

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Kenton R. Cravens, of Missouri, to be Administrator of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

FEDERAL HOUSING COMMISSION

Guy O. Hollyday, of Maryland, to be Federal Housing Commissioner.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

Raymond Blattenberger, of Pennsylvania, to be Public Printer.

House of Representatives

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 15, 1953

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

Rev. Neal Ellis, pastor, South Street Baptist Church, Portsmouth, Va., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, we are grateful to Thee for Thy glorious grace and for all the many blessings that Thou art bestowing upon our great Nation.

We earnestly pray for our Government and our people as we face the stern realization that the welfare of the world and the eternal destiny of multiplied millions of immortal souls will be determined by our actions from day to day. We pray, O God, that Thou wilt grant unto us according to the riches of Thy glory that we will be strengthened with might by Thy spirit in the inner man, that Christ may dwell in our hearts by faith, and that, being rooted and grounded in love, we may be able to comprehend with all saints what is the breadth and length and depth and height; and to know the love of Christ, which passeth knowledge, that we might be filled with all the fullness of God.

And now unto Him that is able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think according to the power that worketh in us, unto Him be glory in all of our hearts by Christ Jesus throughout this critical century. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

WHEAT SHORTAGE IN PAKISTAN

(Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

[Mr. JAVITS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

CORRECTION OF RECORD

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, page 2735 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 1, 1953, containing the vote on final passage of the tideland oil bill to restore the historical rights to the States over the control of part of tidelands, shows I was recognized to change my vote from "yea" to "nay." The official RECORD, the Clerk has informed me, is correct; it was some other Member of the House who was recognized at that time to change the vote from "yea" to "nay." The official roll-call record shows I voted for passage of that bill, and I ask unanimous consent that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. PERKINS asked and was given permission to address the House today for 10 minutes, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. JONES of Alabama asked and was given permission to address the House today for 5 minutes, following any special orders heretofore entered.

CORRECTION OF THE RECORD

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] may correct his remarks in the RECORD of April 14 at page A2000, column 3, line 44, where the word "authorized" should be changed to read "requested."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may be permitted to sit during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

IMPORTATION OF FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL WORKERS

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3480) to amend section 509 of title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, to extend for 3 years the period during which agricultural workers may be made available for employment under such title.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 3480, with Mr. ALLEN of Illinois in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 18 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple bill. It extends section 509 of title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949 for 3 years. Members of the House who were Members of the 82d Congress will remember that in the first session of that Congress we passed a bill which, after much consideration in the House and in the Senate and in conference, was finally worked out into what I believe is generally agreed now to be a very satisfactory measure; in fact, I think the best we have had dealing with the problem of imported agricultural labor.

The Committee on Agriculture held adequate hearings on this measure. At those hearings testimony was heard from the Under Secretary of Labor and other officials of the Department of Labor, from all of the general farm organizations, from one or two labor groups, and from individuals representing some of the organizations of users of this type of labor.

I believe it is generally recognized that we face a very serious problem in this country in the matter of agricultural labor. This bill deals with only one very minor part of that problem. The fact is the operation of the Selective Service Act and the great increase in industrial employment in this country have created a real crisis as far as farm labor is concerned.

I do not believe anyone can say that this measure does more than deal with one aspect of the problem. It relates to a type of labor, stoop labor, which is very much needed in the vegetable fields of the South and West and in other parts of the country. It is a national problem, but it is concentrated in certain areas where the production of fruits and vegetables is an important industry. It is used to some extent in the cotton-producing areas, where the lack of labor which formerly existed there and which has migrated to other areas has created a real problem. It is used to a small extent in the areas where sugar beets are grown. But in the main, this is a problem which relates to those parts of agriculture which are concerned with the production of fresh fruits and vegetables, a very important part of agriculture, and one which in recent years has been forced to expand because of the demand on the part of the American people for larger supplies of these commodities.

This measure in its present form has been in operation during the past 2 years. The situation was critical at the time it was passed and it is even more critical today. Farm labor, that is, the number

of individuals engaged in agricultural labor in this country, has been constantly declining, and it is lower today than it has been at any time in the recent past. The only opposition I have heard expressed to this measure has been on the part of some of the labor organizations which have contended in the past that there is no need for imported agricultural labor. They have taken the position that there was sufficient domestic labor in this country if farmers were willing to pay a high enough price for it and were willing to furnish accommodations better than were generally in existence. That is definitely not the situation. I am not making that statement on my own responsibility, but I am basing it upon the testimony before the committee on the part of the Under Secretary of Labor as well as others who are thoroughly familiar with the situation.

I want to point out also that according to the testimony of the Under Secretary of Labor, out of a total agricultural employment of 13,852,000 last September, which was the peak month in 1952, only 165,000 were Mexican contract workers, thus indicating that while these workers were important and necessary in certain areas they constituted but a small percentage of the total farm labor force. I want to point out also that under this legislation the Secretary of Labor cannot bring Mexican laborers into this country unless he first makes a finding and has certified that sufficient domestic workers who are willing, able, and qualified are not available at the time and place needed to perform the work for which such workers are to be employed. Second, he must certify that the employment of such workers will not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of domestic agricultural workers similarly employed. And third, he must find that reasonable efforts have been made to attract domestic workers for such employment at wage standards and hours of work comparable to those offered foreign workers.

The argument was made before the committee on the part of opponents of this legislation representing labor groups that it was not necessary to extend it for 3 years. It was contended it should be extended for only 1 year or 2 years, on the theory that perhaps in a year or two the farm labor situation might be somewhat different and we would not need the legislation.

I am merely pointing out that under the terms of the law itself, if that situation should exist there will be no Mexican labor brought into the country, and that that objection therefore has no merit.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. Did your committee not give some consideration to the possibility of writing permanent legislation making some sort of arrangement whereby these people could pass freely back and forth across the border? Of course, it is important to bear in mind that there is no quota from Mexico, and it certainly seems to me that it should be possible to

make an arrangement whereby when these people are needed they could come in here just as do the people who work in the forests in Maine and the automobile workers in Detroit, and so on.

Mr. HOPE. The only matter that the committee had before it was this bill. There has been some discussion at various times of some simple method of bringing in this labor, but we did not go into that matter or give it consideration at the time this bill was considered. It seemed to be the general opinion of those interested in the matter that for the present the best solution of the matter would be the continuation of the present legislation.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. This bill purports to renew these provisions for a 3-year period. Is that not right?

Mr. HOPE. Yes.

Mr. CELLER. Would it not be better to make that period shorter so that your committee can have an opportunity to explore this situation, particularly with reference to the fact that along the borders of the four particular States involved there is no real protection against the entrance of subversives into our land? I think the gentleman appreciates that point, does he not?

Mr. HOPE. I think this legislation in itself affords some measure of protection against the entrance of subversives along the Mexican border, in that all the testimony before our committee was to the effect that since this legislation had been in existence, whereby workers could come into this country lawfully, there have not been as many illegal entries as might have been anticipated otherwise. This, of course, does not deal with the immigration situation. We did not attempt to go into that at all. We have no jurisdiction over that matter. That jurisdiction belongs to the gentleman's committee. Certainly the testimony before our committee was that this legislation has lessened the possibility of subversives coming into the United States along the Mexican border.

Mr. CELLER. A recent survey by the New York Times indicated that over 500,000 are apprehended, as so-called wetbacks, who come in illegally; and that survey also indicated that for every one that is caught there are two others that are not caught. That would mean over a million and a half coming in without let or hindrance. There is an insufficient number of men on the border patrol. We have cut to ribbons the appropriations for the Immigration Service, so that it cannot now have an adequate number of men to police the border. I cannot conceive how this legislation has in any degree ameliorated the conditions with reference to the entrance of Communists into this country.

Mr. HOPE. The reason that it has ameliorated the situation is that it has provided a lawful way by which those who desire to come into this country to work in agriculture may do so. If we did not have legislation of this kind, the only way those people could come

in would be to come in illegally. I realize there is a serious problem, in that a great many illegal entrants come into the country every year. But that is a problem of enforcing existing immigration laws, and a matter over which the Committee on Agriculture would not have jurisdiction.

Mr. CELLER. Would it not be well if the Committee on Agriculture would cooperate with the Committee on the Judiciary and possibly hold hearings for a few days to cover all of these situations? Do you not think it would be ill-advised to extend these provisions for 3 years, for that reason? Would it not be better, in view of the vast numbers of illegals coming in, that you do it for, say, 1 year or a year and a half? That would give the gentleman's committee ample time to delve into this problem and come up with some answer.

Mr. HOPE. As far as the question of whether or not the Committee on Agriculture would collaborate with the Committee on the Judiciary is concerned, the gentleman from Kansas would simply say that he has the greatest confidence in the gentleman from New York and other members of the Committee on the Judiciary and their ability to deal with these immigration problems. I do not think we have any business at all to deal with immigration problems in our committee. Of course, we do have this problem that deals with agriculture, and we are trying to take care of that. But I do not think the problems are related, as the gentlemen has indicated. If the Committee on the Judiciary can devise some way to prevent these wetbacks from coming in, I would be glad to go along on any legislation that may be developed.

Mr. CELLER. But in these provisions that we are extending, the right is given to the Secretary of Agriculture to actually hire illegal entrants after they have come in. If they are in a while he has a perfect right to take these men who have violated the law and put legality upon their entrance.

Mr. HOPE. Of course, the only provision in the law to which the gentleman can have reference—and I cannot place my hands on it at the moment—is the provision that does provide for recruitment of those who have been in the country for a period of 5 years.

Mr. CELLER. Yes; section 501, subsection (1), which permits the Secretary to recruit workers who are illegally in the United States. You can read that into that section, read that into the wording of the section.

Mr. HOPE. That, of course, is the gentleman's inference or interpretation of it. It permits the recruitment of such workers who have resided in the United States during the preceding 5 years or who are temporarily in the United States under legal entry.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. CELLER. Does not the gentleman feel that that presents a very serious situation? In the first place, it puts a premium on ability to hide until the statute runs, and then it is important

to bear in mind this very serious fact, that those people are here illegally because they cannot qualify legally because of communicable disease, or because they are felons, or because they are subversives. Last year in the State of California alone 1,500 subversives were deported. It seems to me it ought never to be legal to employ people who cannot qualify to come into the United States legally.

Mr. HOPE. Does not the gentleman think this might be one very excellent method of discovering who these subversives are or who these illegal entrants are if we do go out and employ them under the authority of this act? I do not think this sets a precedent because I do not think many of these people are recruited. I will be glad to look into that a little more fully before the close of the discussion today and advise the gentleman further on it.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I just wanted to allay the fears of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] relative to the purpose of this act; it is to facilitate the orderly recruitment and movement of Mexican agricultural workers, and they do it on a selective basis, sending them to reception centers. Regardless of this bill we would still have the illegal entrance of wetbacks in this country. You could have a revenue man stationed every half mile on the border and you would still have them coming in, I may say to the gentleman from New York, because there are ways and means; they want to come in, and they do come in.

I think because they are selected workers sent to a reception center that we need have little fear of the Communist group among these people. These workers are stoop laborers and most of the Communists are educated fellows who do not want to get out and get their hands dirty in the fields; they want to get busy spreading communism, not out working with their hands in the beet fields.

The farmers in my district of Nebraska where we raise many sugar beets need this stoop labor because the Selective Service law has stripped the farms of the country of the boys who otherwise would stay on the farms and produce sugar beets and do the manual labor. Without this stoop labor we would have a very critical employment problem.

The subversives would come in whether or not we had this bill and regardless of this bill. The Communists, as I say, do not want to work with their hands and get their hands dirty. This bill deals with selected workers to help the farmers of the United States who need help badly.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman very briefly.

Mr. CELLER. I understand that these wetbacks have traveled all the way up to Nebraska. As a matter of fact, the evidence has shown these illegals go all over the country. They are up in Port-

land, Maine, they are in all of the States of the North; so that this is becoming a national problem. I think we ought to address ourselves to the evils attendant upon our failure to set up proper safeguards.

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. GOLDEN. At the time the Labor Department had its representative testify before the committee was it not shown that the operation of this bill greatly reduced the number of wetbacks entering this country? Did not the testimony also show that they were receiving cooperation from the Mexican Government as well as the farm owners and that this has been found to be the best remedy yet discovered to reduce the illegal entrance of these Mexicans into the United States?

Mr. HOPE. There is no question about that. That was the testimony of the Under Secretary of Labor and all other representatives of the Labor Department who appeared before the committee. I do not think that anyone who knows the facts will dispute that assertion at all.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. May I ask the gentleman, Does this legislation affect only the recruitment and employment of agricultural workers from Mexico?

Mr. HOPE. Yes.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Does it affect the Jamaicans who come into this country?

Mr. HOPE. No. This does not deal with agricultural labor from any country except Mexico.

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, has explained, this bill, H. R. 3480, merely amends section 509 of title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949 by extending for 3 years the period during which agricultural workers may be made available for employment under such title. As he has said, there is a demand in this Nation for laborers from Mexico.

Some of our friends here seem to be excited over the fact that this bill may bring in more wetbacks; but, as a matter of fact, this bill eliminates to a certain extent the coming in of wetbacks because the matter is in charge of the Labor Department and the Agricultural Department of this Nation. These workers necessarily have to be cleared with the Mexican Government before they enter the United States.

I am not personally interested in this legislation because none of these laborers work in my district and, so far as that is concerned, none of them are employed in my State. But in Texas, Arkansas, California, and a good many other States of the Union there is a seasonal demand for these agricultural workers.

The Committee on Agriculture has been considering this legislation for several years. It has worked satisfactorily in the past and the committee by unanimous action has voted to extend the measure for 3 years.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I realize that crops must be harvested and I also realize at this time it is very essential that the farmers in these farming areas must get help. Farmers must recruit migrant workers by importing them. They cannot get labor in the United States. I am for bringing in the Mexicans, and elsewhere. The gravamen of my complaint is that there are not proper safeguards in the act that permit their coming in.

For example, the New York Times—and I referred to it in my colloquy today with the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture—reports under date of January 11, as follows:

In 1952 this invasion of wetbacks reached a peak of 1,500,000 or more aliens, it is indicated by the best available statistical evidence.

According to figures just compiled from official sources, the apprehension of illegal aliens * * * totaled approximately 618,000.

Then information has reached the Committee on the Judiciary in our investigations that for every one caught there are two who go undetected. So, the conclusion is that over 1,500,000 have come in illegally in each year.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. My understanding is, and I believe there is little question about it, that this does not represent 600,000 different individuals; that in many cases 1 man has been deported 15 or 20 times, because they took him over and he came right back again. The figures are 600,000 deportations.

Mr. CELLER. Let us assume that some duplications are involved. Discount those figures, and I do not care how you discount them. If you be reasonable in your discount you will still have this vast array of illegals coming in. Section 501 subdivision of the act permits the Secretary to recruit workers illegally in the United States; it permits recruitments of wetbacks who have illegally resided in the United States for the last 5 years as well as contract workers who have overstayed any admission period. Section 501 of the act should read "Who are legally in the United States" and not "In the United States under legal entry." The language of the present law is tricky. It should be nailed down so that the Secretary cannot hire anyone who has not satisfied our immigration and other statutes as to health, security, and the like.

As the situation has developed now, there is no health examination, no security examination, and one would think that enlightened self-interest would prompt those along the border States to see to it that there are proper safeguards, especially health examinations.

Along the border counties of Texas, for example—and I am reading from Migratory Labor in American Agriculture, report of the President's Commission on Migratory Labor:

One of the most sensitive indicators of the state of public health in any population is the rate of infant mortality. This is defined as the number of deaths under 1 year of age per 1,000 live births. For the United States at large, this rate in 1948 was 32. The statewide average for Texas was 46.2; for the 28 counties of Texas on or immediately adjacent to the border, the average rate was 79.5. In the three counties commonly regarded as constituting the lower Rio Grande Valley, the infant mortality rates were as follows:

Cameron-----	82.5
Hidalgo-----	107.2
Willacy-----	127.6

Those figures must give us pause. The numbers that are coming in undetected are increasing yearly. The figures for 1952 are larger than the figures for 1951, so it is not true that there is effective control here. Control becomes less effective.

I repeat, I want the crops harvested and gathered; on the other hand, we must see to it that our security laws are upheld, and it is our duty to protect the health of the Nation. The gentleman from Nebraska admits that they employ Mexican migrants up in his State. They are, frankly, infiltrating throughout the country. What are you doing about it? You cannot extend this act for another 3 years with all its evils. In the emergency, extend, say, for only 1 year.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. It seems to me it is up to the Immigration Service to prevent those wetbacks from coming over.

Mr. CELLER. The Immigration Service complains they have not got enough men to patrol the borders, and in our economy-minded attitude we slashed to ribbons the appropriations for that particular service.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. GOLDEN].

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Chairman, I think the problem that has been presented to the House by the gentleman from New York is not necessarily involved in this bill. I think there is a problem, but I think it should be solved by the immigration authorities and not the Committee on Agriculture.

As I stated a minute ago, I feel sure the adoption of this bill will help to relieve the very situation the gentleman from New York has spoken about.

There is one thing certain: The proof before our committee showed that the Labor Department had advertised and recruited all of the American labor they could possibly get before any Mexican labor was employed. It comes down to a proposal of permitting these crops to perish in the field and not be harvested or taking in this very small limited number of legal entrants.

Mr. Chairman, our committee held exhaustive hearings and heard much testimony concerning the reenactment of this bill. We heard testimony from the Department of Agriculture and Department of Labor, both of which are vitally concerned in the administration of this act. Both of these Departments favor the reenactment of this bill.

All of the testimony that I heard indicated that there is a real need for the importation of Mexican labor to help gather the crops in many of the Southern States. It was further shown that they could not get sufficient American labor to do this work, and these crops are needed by the consuming American public and some of them constitute valuable exports to other countries that strengthen the economy of the entire Nation.

However, I feel that great improvement can be made, and should be made, in the administration of this act. There are many troublesome problems connected with it. The Labor Department heretofore has done a great deal of work in bringing into these regions American labor. They have advertised and recruited labor from different parts of the United States and have furnished transportation for them for as many as would go each year. However, the kind of labor that is required and that is ordinarily referred to as stoop labor does not appeal to many American agriculture workers and hardly at all to the American laboring men who are accustomed to working in factories. If we were forced to depend altogether upon American labor, there is no doubt in my mind but that the crops in large measure would not be harvested and we would have an economic loss, not only to the farmers but to the consuming public throughout the United States.

Each year, although the Labor Department has endeavored to recruit all possible American labor that it could, they find themselves several thousand short to harvest the perishable crops in many of the Southern States. There is a constant menace and injury going on down on the border between Mexico and the United States. Many Mexican men enter this country illegally. They are ordinarily called "wetbacks" because they slip across the border and either wade or swim the river in many places. These Mexicans who enter the country illegally are the worst menace we have to contend with. They do not come in under our Labor Department or Agriculture Department, but when they enter the country illegally, many of them move north and undertake to stay in this country permanently and finally they get into competition with American labor and help to lower the standards of American labor, but it is almost impossible for the immigration authorities to prevent all of them from slipping into this country without a right to do so. The program under this bill, which is worked out by an agreement between the United States and the Mexican Government has done more to stop the large number of illegal entrants or wetbacks than anything else.

The farm owners are cooperating with the Department of Agriculture and Department of Labor and they are refusing to employ Mexicans who enter this country illegally. This tends to cut down to a very large degree the number of Mexicans that come in without legal permission to do so. Heretofore we have had agreements with the Mexican Government about furnishing Mexican labor to come into the United States under this program, but I believe that our representatives who negotiate these agreements with the Government of Mexico can greatly improve that system and can save the United States and especially the farm owners a good deal of money.

Heretofore the Mexican Government has insisted on bringing a large part of this Mexican labor from the interior of Mexico and the transportation charges by reason of this are much higher than they should be and there is room for improvement in obtaining the right sort of agreement between the United States and Mexico. The permission to allow Mexican labor to come in and do this hard manual labor is of great benefit to the Government of Mexico and it is my belief that we can negotiate better agreements with that Government than has been done in the past. I also think that with the experience heretofore acquired by the Departments of Agriculture and Labor that many improvements can be made in the administration of this act and that provisions can be made to see that these legally admitted Mexicans, after the job is done, are returned to Mexico and not allowed to escape into interior portions of the United States, and I think we can further improve our situation by the proper administration of this act in cutting down to a material degree the number of wetbacks that enter this country illegally.

Setting this program up on a 3-year basis so that the various departments of the United States Government will know what to expect will give them a much better opportunity to tighten up on this program and will enable them to know what to expect to administer this law more effectively than ever before and at the same time I think that a good deal of money can be saved to the Federal Government and to the landowners by better administration of the act and by making a more sensible and advantageous agreement with the Government of Mexico.

For that reason and because of the great need to gather these crops I think the bill should be passed and that it should be for a period of 3 years rather than for 1 year.

These various departments protect in every way they can the American labor. They require standards of pay that does not undermine the laboring people of America and the Department of Labor places every American worker that desires to do this work on the job before any foreign labor is used. It is simply a question of a shortage that cannot be met by American labor and it would be an unwise policy to allow these valuable crops to perish in the field and the only way to save them is to reenact

this act and improve the administration of it.

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, we of course all recognize the seriousness of the problem of the agriculturalist in obtaining stoop labor, but in attempting to solve it I do not think we should open the doors to the sort of thing that will occur under the provisions of this bill. It seems to me the way to meet the situation is to amend the bill extending the time by shortening the period, with the hope that during that time a long-range, permanent solution can be found.

It seems to me to be much more simple than the State or Justice Department believes it to be. In my judgment, there is no reason in the world why, after careful screening, work permits cannot be issued to the desirable workers wishing to come to the United States.

I repeat what I said a moment ago, there are no quotas between the United States and Mexico. There is no reason why all the people needed cannot come to the United States. But it seems to me that in obtaining all the workers needed in our economy we should pay attention to the type of people who come. Under the law which this bill would amend, it is legal to employ workers who have been in the United States for 5 years illegally.

Who is it that comes here illegally? It is the person who cannot meet the health requirements, it is the person who is a felon, it is the person who is subversive. In obtaining this temporary stoop labor we should make certain that none of that type of undesirable alien is employed in the United States. It has been stated that this might be a way of ascertaining who they are. I do not agree with that at all. This is a huge problem and it is the kind of a problem that ought to be dealt with after careful consideration of the security of the United States.

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Chairman, I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS].

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, farming is a laudable undertaking. To meet the needs of an expanding population for food and fiber is of vital concern to all of us. It is estimated that there will be a population of 190 million people in America by 1975. In addition to supplying the necessary commodities for the sustenance of such a large population a goodly percent of the total production in farm products goes into export channels.

In 1790, practically all the population of the United States was engaged in agriculture, the first census taken shows that the urban population was 5.1 against rural population of 94.9. A series of percentages through the years is as follows:

1950: Urban 64 as against 36.0 rural.
1949: Urban 56.5 as against 43.05 rural.
1930: Urban 56.2 as against 43.08 rural.
1920: Urban 51.2 as against 48.8 rural.
1910: Urban 45.7 as against 54.3 rural.
1900: Urban 39.7 as against 60.3 rural.

The picture is different today. Farm employment in the years from 1946 to

1949 averaged only 11 million out of a population of 145 million or more people. This 11 million figure was reduced to 10 million in 1951. In 1952 the average declined to 9.8 million. This stupendous reduction in the farm labor supply has resulted in spite of the fact that the overall labor force during these years has shown a net increase. There has been a steady exodus from America's farms to the industrial centers where fabulous wages have been offered and paid these workers who had previously been employed in agriculture. From 1940 to 1950 many States in the Union lost population—principally because of the pay incentive and inducement offered industrial workers in the metropolitan areas. As a result those States have lost seats in this body.

It is a difficult problem to obtain workers for the harvesting of vegetables, fruits, sugarbeet, and cotton. This type of work requires stoop labor.

Under Secretary of Labor Lloyd A. Mashburn stated before our committee that it was necessary to contract 197,100 Mexican workers during the crop year 1952. This figure was only a small percent of the total agricultural employment during the peak month of September, which was 13,852,000. The major labor force in agriculture is represented by farmers who live on the land, and their families. It is necessary to supplement this force in many States. Twenty-three States have found it necessary to contract for Mexican workers for short periods of time during the peak harvest season.

Although the Mexican migrant worker represents only a small percent of the total of those employed in American agriculture, it is most vital in many States that these workers be made available when the particular commodity is ready for harvest.

In the cottongrowing area of the mid-South an intense program is instituted by the State employment security offices of the Department of Labor to marshal as many workers from the domestic work force as is possible. Advertisements are placed in the papers, ministers tell the story from the pulpit, notices are posted on bulletin boards that workers are badly needed in the cottonfields to harvest the crop.

Before any farmer can obtain migrant workers under the provision of the law that is now on the statute books, such employer must enter into an agreement with the United States to do this:

(1) To indemnify the United States against loss by reason of its guaranty of such employer's contracts;

(2) To reimburse the United States for essential expenses, not including salaries or expenses of regular department or agency personnel, incurred by it for the transportation and subsistence of workers under this title in amounts not to exceed \$15 per worker; and

(3) To pay to the United States, in any case in which a worker is not returned to the reception center in accordance with the contract entered into under section 501 (5), an amount determined by the Secretary of Labor to be equivalent to the normal cost to the employer of returning other workers from the place of employment to such recep-

tion center, less any portion thereof required to be paid by other employers.

No worker is to be recruited unless the Secretary of Labor has determined and certified (1) sufficient domestic workers who are able, willing, and qualified are not available at the time and place needed to perform the work for which such workers are to be employed; (2) the employment of such workers will not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of domestic agricultural workers similarly employed; and (3) reasonable efforts have been made to attract domestic workers for such employment at wages and standard hours of work comparable to those offered to foreign workers.

Every precaution was made by this Congress to protect domestic workers and assure such domestic workers that they are given the first opportunity to be employed on the farm.

It is most expensive to agriculture producers to obtain foreign workers. He must pay the Mexican worker the prevailing wage in the community. He must give such worker an insurance policy against accident, pay transportation charges from the assembling center far into Mexico to the reception center at the border and back to such place after the contract has terminated. He must also transport such workers from the border to the farm and return. In addition he is called upon to provide living accommodations, water, fuel for heating, cooking utensils, beds, mattresses, blankets, and all other such facilities. The foreign worker pays no part of these expenses.

If there were any possible opportunity to obtain a sufficient number of local farm laborers, the farmer would take them in preference to the Mexican workers. To do so would eliminate the extra expense to get his crop harvested.

This bill comes before you by unanimous vote of the Committee on Agriculture, asking a simple extension of Publaw 78 of the 82d Congress, 1st session, for the period of 3 years.

I trust that this body will see fit to pass this meritorious proposal.

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY].

(Mr. McCARTHY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, when this legislation was presented in 1951, it was presented as temporary legislation. I quote from the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL] in the year the bill was passed:

There is another thing I want to say, and that is that this is a temporary bill.

The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] in June 1951, also said:

It is a temporary measure but one which will meet the present situation.

We are today extending this for another 3 years, even though the original bill has another year to run.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. HOPE. Does the gentleman think the situation has improved any since this bill was passed as far as the farm labor situation is concerned? We hoped at that time that the farm labor situa-

tion would improve; as a matter of fact, it has deteriorated and the need for the bill is greater now than it was in 1951.

Mr. McCARTHY. The argument that was made in 1951 was that the Secretary of Agriculture was imposing additional obligations upon the farmers. Now, does that still hold with regard to cotton, for example? Has the Secretary imposed any additional obligation with regard to fruits and vegetables at this time?

Mr. HOPE. The people of this country have a standard of living that demands the consumption of greater and greater quantities of fresh fruits and vegetables, and we have had a great market in cotton; we have no important surplus of cotton. The fact is that the burden on the farmers of this country, whether imposed by the Secretary of Agriculture or by the law of supply and demand, is still as great as it ever was, and particularly in the chief commodities which are the subject of the Mexican type of labor.

Mr. McCARTHY. As a matter of fact, the Secretary of Agriculture has asked for a decreased production of cotton. I just want to know whether if this is temporary legislation, how long it is going to be temporary. And if it is permanent legislation, why has not the committee, which has had time, examined the whole problem of migratory labor? The President's Commission made an extensive study and report of this problem.

Why has no provision been made with regard to foreign labor brought in from other countries? And why is no attempt made to solve the problem of domestic migratory labor, which is one of the greatest social-economic problems in these United States?

Mr. HOPE. Does the gentleman favor making this bill permanent law rather than a 3-year extension?

Mr. McCARTHY. I think if we are going to have this problem continuously before us, that the bill should have made some beginning at least toward solving the problem of domestic migrants in this country.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I understood the gentleman to say that I said this was a temporary bill.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is right.

Mr. HILL. Let me ask my distinguished colleague from Minnesota whether or not this bill providing for an extension of the law does not qualify under the designation "temporary"? All we are doing at the present time is to ask for a temporary extension.

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes; for 3 years. I understand that we must legislate in time and that we are not legislating for eternity. If the gentleman means by "temporary" a period in the history of the United States, I may be willing to accept that limited definition. Certainly we are not legislating for eternity.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. As I understand, we are all temporary Members of this House.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is right.

Mr. HILL. The second question I want to ask—and if my memory serves me correctly it is admitted that some other Members have temporary memories, too—let me ask the gentleman this: I have the impression, although I could be entirely mistaken, that within the last year you have had very important immigration legislation passed by the Congress. Is not that true?

Mr. McCARTHY. That is right.

Mr. HILL. Then it is not our business here today to consider wetbacks coming in or going out. This bill has nothing to do with wetbacks.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am concerned principally about our failure to do anything to meet the problem of American domestic migrants.

Mr. HILL. It is not the province of the Agriculture Committee—I appreciate the gentleman's membership on that committee—it is not within our province to come into this House with permanent and definite legislation on immigration.

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield no further. I think the gentleman is right in saying that the Agriculture Committee perhaps has no authority over permanent immigration legislation, and probably no real authority over temporary legislation such as this, if we are going to be strict about it. Perhaps we should have called this emergency legislation, but, then, in view of the gentleman's party's declaration against emergency legislation we probably would have had no bill.

Mr. HILL. Probably we should have called the other one emergency legislation and this one temporary.

Mr. McCARTHY. I hope the gentleman will get me more time so I may proceed with my discussion. I would like to make one point, however, with regard to the illegal Mexican labor.

The House of Representatives was told in 1951 that the Mexican farm-labor bill would improve and solve the wetback problem—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 7326, June 26, 1951.

Mr. COOLEY. We are trying to improve the wetback situation.

Mr. POAGE. That is right. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 7328, June 26, 1951.)

Mr. FISHER. The passage of this bill would be a death blow to this wetback situation about which we have heard so much today; is that not correct?

Mr. HILL. Yes.

The facts:

First. The number of illegal entries apprehended in the United States has increased as follows:

1946-----	100,000
1948-----	200,000
1950-----	572,000
1951-----	736,000
1952-----	651,000

Second. The Mexican farm-labor program has been in operation for 2-crop years. It was supposed to solve the illegal-entries problem. Yet, the number of wetbacks apprehended in the United States has increased so much that the Mexican Government is this year contemplating stationing Mexican troops along the border in an effort to prevent the flow of its citizens into the United States as illegal immigrants.

Third. The facts indicate a possible relationship between the illegal-entries problem and Mexican farm labor-importation program. Up to the middle of World War II illegal immigration from Mexico averaged around 10,000 to 12,000 persons per year. The extremely large and sudden increase in the number of illegals started in 1944. The contract-labor program started the year before. The relationship between the two facts is more than coincidental. Once having been in the United States as a contract worker, the Mexican worker knows the locations of farms and employers and is presented with a strong temptation to strike out on his own. This is the case because competition is keen among Mexican workers for the jobs in question, so that the worker jumps the gun and goes across the border on his own, rather than risk not being selected for a contract job. Even if he has never been in the United States, the existence of the contract program advertises the fact that jobs are available in the United States, and so he is lured across the border as a illegal entrant. The situation is made even more tempting for him by virtue of the ease with which he can cross the border.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. HILL. I question the gentleman's figures on wetbacks.

Mr. McCARTHY. I got them from the present Republican administration.

Mr. HILL. I doubt very much if anyone anywhere has any definite figures or count on the number of wetbacks who slip across the Mexican border.

Mr. McCARTHY. These are only the ones who are caught. I am not talking about the number that came in.

Mr. HILL. That is not correct either, because they might catch the same man 10 times.

Mr. McCARTHY. That may be right.

Mr. HILL. That is right.

Mr. McCARTHY. This bill should have prevented them from coming in the first time.

Mr. HILL. Let me say frankly, I think the Agricultural Committee lost a real member and a very valuable member when the gentleman was removed from our committee.

Mr. McCARTHY. I appreciate the gentleman's comment.

Mr. HILL. But let me speak about the wetbacks coming in. I have seen that border. As soon as the sun goes down and the moon does not come up, they do not have to come over as a wetback; they can walk over on dry land. Now we are not considering immigration; we are considering a bill involving emergency farm labor. I think the gentleman has some basis for questioning this bill and if we were considering this as an immigration bill I would be opposed to it. But it is nothing more or less than a temporary emergency labor law. That is what the law is now and that is all we can make out of it.

Here is another thing I would like to call attention to. The Department of Labor representative who appeared be-

fore our committee gave one of the best talks on this legislation that we had in the entire hearing. Certainly he knew firsthand that he was talking about emergency labor and not about immigration. Let us not get off on the immigration laws because you will have wetbacks coming in here, probably a less number of them because we get a better count, than you did previously. I know the gentleman wants to be fair.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. This wetback bill that we have had up here recurrently over the years has done one thing, as I see it. It has made two classes of wetbacks, the legal wetbacks and the illegal wetbacks. Is that not about the way it has worked out?

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not think we should apply that name to them. It has created some problems.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to comment on the remarks of the gentleman from Colorado as to what happens when the moon is down on the border. The statistics show that up until 1944 the number of illegal entrants was about 10 to 12 thousand a year. In 1943, I believe it was, we passed the first law legalizing entrance into the United States. In 1944 the number of illegal entrants jumped and has been increasing since. Maybe someone from Texas can tell us whether there has been a great planetary change there with regard to moonshine or lack of moonshine following 1943.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to make one more point with regard to this legislation, all of which I hope will be added to the basic argument I am making that either permanent legislation should have been brought in or we should have been given broad opportunities to amend this bill. My point has to do with cost of the program.

In 1951 several members of the committee said there was no subsidy in the bill. The Grange testified that they did not want any subsidy. Speaking against an amendment which I offered, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] said:

No, Mr. Chairman, there is no subsidy in this bill.

Page 7369, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 27, 1951, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], in speaking against the McCarthy amendment to prorate all costs among users of imported labor, said:

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota has just stated that we should not pay a subsidy to American farmers. I fully agree with him. That has been one of the objectives of the subcommittee that wrote this bill, from the very beginning. We do not propose to pay a subsidy to anybody. We want to give the Government agencies the opportunity to recoup all the costs.

Page 7370, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 27, 1951:

Mr. COOLEY. Let me make this clear: There is no subsidy contemplated by this bill. It is contended that the farmer shall do just what the gentleman has indicated he should do; that is, to pay all the cost incurred from the time he takes him from the reception center until he is returned there.

What has it cost?

Transportation and subsistence, July 15, 1951-Dec. 31, 1952

Employees brought in.....	340,000
Average cost per employee.....	\$11.25

Total receipts (received from employers)	\$5,378,000
Total expenditures.....	\$3,643,600

Surplus.....	\$1,734,400
--------------	-------------

Administrative costs (paid by Government):

Calendar year 1951—July 15 to Dec. 31:

Number of employees brought in.....	140,000
Total cost.....	\$1,400,000
Average cost per employee.....	\$10.00

Calendar year 1952—Jan. 1 to Dec. 31:

Number of employees brought in.....	197,000
Total cost.....	\$2,245,800
Average cost per employee.....	\$11.40

Total administrative cost (paid by Government):

1951.....	\$1,400,000
1952.....	2,245,800

Total (paid by Government).....	3,645,800
---------------------------------	-----------

Additional costs (paid by Government):

Skips:

1951—6,949 at \$30 per skip equals.....	188,470
1952—2,115 at \$30 per skip equals.....	63,450

Total skip cost.....	251,920
----------------------	---------

Department of Labor administrative cost.....	3,645,800
Skip cost.....	251,920

Total.....	3,897,720
Minus surplus from employers.....	1,734,400

Cost to Government.....	2,163,320
-------------------------	-----------

This final cost figure is incomplete. It does not include total Immigration Service costs.

Here are the statistics in regard to cost:

So, the program now is not self-sufficient; it does involve a subsidy, a subsidy which would not have existed if the amendment I offered in 1951 had been accepted and which I would offer today if a bill permitting extensive amendments from the floor were before the House.

I think we need to come to the realization that we do have a great problem here in regard to migratory agricultural labor, a matter of national policy, which we should face up to now rather than postpone it from year to year. It involves not only the approximate 200,000 legal foreign laborers who are brought in but approximately a half million American citizens who migrate throughout the area of the South and the West and the Southwest. This bill makes no

real progress toward solving the problems of these people.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Can the gentleman state what this tragic situation is with reference to migratory labor in the country at the present time?

Mr. McCARTHY. Can I describe it to you?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Yes. Tell us about it.

Mr. McCARTHY. Well, it has been adequately described to you in the report of the President's Commission on Migratory Labor which, as a member of the Agricultural Committee, you should have seen.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I wish the gentleman would explain it to the House. I am not aware of it in the way the gentleman has tried to state that it exists.

Mr. McCARTHY. Well, as I recall, the average annual wage of these people was approximately \$350 per year. That is an indication as to the standard of living they are enjoying. The gentleman from New York submitted some statistics in regard to the infant mortality among these people which shows that it is away above that of the national average, and in some cases two or three times that. I will include the additional information the gentleman desires.

The largest element in the migratory group in the United States is made up of the so-called Texas-Americans, that is, Texans of Mexican or other Latin-American origin. This group was previously migratory within Texas and from Texas into the Mountain and Great Lakes region. Within recent years its migrancy has increased both in numbers and in area of movement. The primary reason for this increase in migrancy is pressure from the influx of illegal Mexican workers, and to a degree also from legal entrants which has made it necessary for these Texas-Mexicans—United States citizens—to leave their homes annually in search of better wages and more secure employment opportunity elsewhere. For example, in 1949, some 65,000 Latin-Americans left their homes in south Texas—were displaced—to work in agriculture in other States. Wages in their home State were as low as 15 cents an hour, but in the same year Texas farmers imported 46,000 Mexican nationals to work in agriculture in Texas. This number does not include the thousands of Mexican workers who entered illegally and who worked in the fields of Texas.

This Texas-Mexican group, together with ex-sharecroppers, and their descendants who moved from Florida, along the Atlantic Ocean through the Carolinas, Virginia, New Jersey, and New York, and even into Maine, make up about half of the 1,000,000 migratory agricultural workers. The other 500,000 has been made up of approximately 100,000 Mexicans, legally under contract, a small number of British West Indians, and Puerto Ricans, and estimated 400,-

000 illegal Mexican workers, the so-called wetbacks.

ANNUAL INCOME

The plight of these 1,000,000 human beings is truly tragic. Their housing, wages, food, are often wholly inadequate. Their standard of living is a national disgrace. During 1949, when crop controls were not imposed, 70 percent of these workers had fewer than 75 days at agricultural jobs. Only 5 percent had 250 days or more. During this same year they averaged 70 days of agricultural work and 31 days of nonfarm work, making a total yearly average of 101 days' employment. For farm work they received \$352 and for nonfarm work \$162, making a total average income of \$514 for the year. Farm workers receive some perquisites, such as housing, which increased their real wages. The value of these for migratory workers as estimated by the United States Department of Agriculture in 1945 was about 36 cents per day. Multiplying this by an average of about 100 days' employment, gives \$36 increase in the average annual wage of the migratory workers, making an average annual income of \$550.

HOUSING

Members of the Commission report that the on-the-job housing of migratory workers consists of barracks, cabins, trailers, tents, rooming houses, auto court cabins, shack houses, and not infrequently a spot under a tree near a ditch. Much, if not most, housing of migratory workers is below a minimum standard of decency. Home base housing is even worse.

HEALTH

The diet of migrant farm laborers was found insufficient to maintain health. A physician testifying before the Commission made this statement:

I can say from the reports of the nurses that we do have dietary deficiency diseases such as pellagra and cases of that have come to my attention—due to a diet consisting of corn meal and perhaps rice and very little else—no vitamins. There are also evidences of merely ordinary starvation among many of these people which the nurses report * * *.

A survey which I made and photographed, in the Mathis, Tex., labor camps, showed that 96 percent of the children in that camp had not consumed any milk whatsoever in the last 6 months. It also showed that 8 out of every 10 adults had not eaten any meat in the last 6 months. * * * The reason given was that they could not afford it with the money they were making.

CHILD LABOR

Child labor is common. The child's earnings are needed. This is the same reason given decades ago as justification for child labor in the coal mines, cotton mills, and other industries.

The trouble is that no one accepts responsibility in the matter. The grower claims that it is no concern of his what these families do when not in his employ. The consumer who breakfasts on food-stuffs from the far corners of the hemisphere does not see what he can do about it. Local and State relief authorities tend to feel that the problem is beyond their resources.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

(Mr. McCARTHY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, my colleague from Minnesota seems to be concerned about this legislation because it has been termed an emergency piece of legislation. He seems to think that the Republican administration, after having been in power for only 84 days, can correct all of the emergencies that have been forced upon the administration for the past 20 years. Now he should be a little cooperative and try to assist us in passing this bill so that we can get the labor to produce the perishable crops which are consumed by the people of the city of St. Paul and elsewhere in the country. I am sure he is concerned about that because he was on the Committee on Agriculture and a representative of the consumers for a couple of years.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think the record should show I submitted some information to the committee this year while they were holding hearings, and I offered a couple of what I considered constructive amendments to this bill in 1951. Nearly all of them were rejected, but certainly if they had been accepted this legislation, I would feel, would not need to be called temporary, it could be looked upon as having some permanent status.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I think it is a permanent proposition for this country because you will no longer find American citizens who are willing to do this type of stoop labor. Further, they do not have to do it because they are under social security and can draw compensation from the social security system when they state that that is not their customary type of work. So we have passed the day when we can count on American labor to do this kind of work to produce the food and the fiber for the American people.

I am not concerned about them. We do not use a great deal of this kind of labor in my area; some, it is true, because we cannot get Americans to do the work. We cannot use this type of labor on the dairy farms and the regular diversified farms of the country, but this type of labor is needed to produce the fruits and vegetables that make up a large portion of the diet of the American people.

I was rather amazed at some of the statements that have been made here that we should stop this labor from coming into the country. My colleague from Minnesota has said that if we did not pass this bill we would remedy the situation. It might appear to some people, and even to me, that they want a scarcity of fruits, vegetables, and cotton so they can have higher prices, possibly, and get an increase in the cost of living and an increase in wages. That will be the end result, because if we do not get the labor to produce this food

and fiber we are going to have higher prices and shortages.

We had before our committee a representative of a great labor organization. He was opposed to Mexican labor coming into the country. I also want American labor employed when it is available, but when Americans will not do this type of work, necessity demands the type of labor permitted in this bill to produce the food for American consumers.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think, if the gentleman will read my remarks, he will be able to correct a few statements he has made. But let me ask him this: I know what his position is with respect to the tariff generally. How does he justify his position here in favor of bringing in cheap foreign labor to be used in producing crops in this country while he opposes the importation of cheap foreign products, principally because they have been produced by labor which has not been adequately paid? What is the difference between exploiting it abroad and exploiting it here?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Can the gentlemen tell me where we can find any American labor, organized or unorganized, to do this type of work in the fields?

Mr. McCARTHY. I think you can get much more American labor if you pay them adequately. That should be the first attempt—to give them decent standards of living, decent working conditions, and some assurance. Under this proposed legislation, the imported laborer gets much better assurance of employment, he gets assurance of better pay, and he gets better conditions of work than the American laborer who is in the same area.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Under this act and the agreements reached with Mexico, these people are treated much better than any American citizens.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is what I say. Why do we not do something about these American citizens?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. We cannot legislate on American citizens. They have the minimum wage.

Mr. McCARTHY. They do not have it in this field.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. They are paid comparable wages in accordance with what the standard is in the area. That is my understanding.

The gentleman has asked me a question as to why I favor bringing this labor into the country, and then being against having cheap labor outside the United States produce things to ship into this country. I just want to feed the gentleman very well, so that he can have an abundant supply of all kinds of food for his constituents, for the constituents of the gentleman from New York, who is opposing this bill, and for the rest of the American people. If we do not get it produced for lack of American labor I cannot follow the philosophy that we ought to let foreign labor produce it outside the United States. We have the land here in this country and we should use it up to the maximum productive capacity in the production of food. I know that we have problems. We have problems because the gentle-

man and others favor free trade. They favor increasing foreign production and bringing the commodities into the United States. I know the gentleman is a great student and I hope he has read the Bell committee report. Mr. Bell was the head of a commission appointed by President Truman to study our foreign-trade relations. The committee filed a report recently. Do you know what they recommend? They recommend free trade in every line. They say we should let all foreign products come in here. These are produced by cheap labor and if anybody is thrown out of work in this country the committee has made an unusual recommendation. They recommend to increase the social-security payments and put the unemployed American on high social security and then if a farm or an industry is thrown out of work because of these imports they say to transport these people from one part of the United States to another until you find some type of work for them to do. I am opposed to that kind of a deal for the American workers and for the American farmers. There is nothing that would bring about a lowering of the standard of living of the American people quicker than free trade. That is the way I feel about it. I know the gentleman disagrees with me, but we cannot help that. We have a right to our own convictions.

Mr. REGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. REGAN. The gentleman is making some very good points which I hope our colleagues generally and our colleague the gentleman from Minnesota are taking in. The gentleman is exactly right about this. The gentleman has been making statements about cheap labor. I do not know what you pay for wheat harvesters in Minnesota. What is the daily average, Mr. ANDRESEN?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. It varies but you have to pay as high as \$200 a month with room and board.

Mr. REGAN. This so-called cheap labor to which the gentleman has constantly referred comes over from Mexico and they earn more than \$10 and \$12 a day in United States money, which in Mexico is the equivalent of 85 to 100 pesos a day—a fortune. So you can see that it is not cheap labor. I think we ought to get off of that subject. The gentleman says they earn \$350 a year. If they only earn \$350 a year it is because they are only working a couple of weeks or 3 or 4 weeks and then they go back home. They are not working a full year for that money. But they make enough in 2 or 3 weeks to provide enough to live the balance of the year in Mexico.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. May I remind the gentleman that I have been addressing my remarks principally to the American workers in this field. I have not been concerned about the Mexicans who can take advantage of the exchange rate. I have not opposed this bill. All I have been saying is that we ought to do some-

thing about raising the standard of our own American migratory farm workers. That I hope has been the principal weight of my arguments.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is a very laudable ambition and I hope the gentleman succeeds. In our section of the country, as the gentleman knows, we have very little migratory labor and the men who are working on the farms in our area are paid very good wages because the industries in the gentleman's city and other cities take the regular hired labor away from the average farm, and the farmer must get along with his wife and children to operate the farm. Furthermore, the draft comes along and takes many of the essential farm boys away from this essential production of food. We are in a very difficult situation which I am sure the gentleman does appreciate.

Let me add just one more comment concerning this Bell report which I have mentioned. The Bell report was subscribed to by the A. F. of L., the CIO, and other labor organizations. The report has come out now urging free trade for the United States. I know there may be some groups in Congress who want that type of policy. I cannot understand how our labor leaders are ready to sacrifice their own workers. Take the case of Henry Ford, who has had a lot of publicity lately. Of course, he is not a labor leader, but certainly Mr. Reuther is the head of one of the big labor organizations in that industry. Mr. Ford wants free trade. He wants to go over into foreign countries to build factories. For what? To secure cheap labor to make Ford automobiles and to ship them into the United States, which will eventually put the automobile workers out of business in this country. He does not say he wants to be protected on that, on this matter of free trade or what he does in other countries. But his tax attorney said it. His tax attorney said they should have protection on their foreign profits by way of elimination of taxes in this country.

Other groups who want free trade say they should have guaranties from the Treasury of the United States or the American taxpayer to protect their investment abroad.

What kind of monkey business are we engaged in? We should have an American policy to protect our American standard of living and keep our country great. If we do not do that, we in the Congress will be responsible for the tragedy that will fall upon the American people.

I urge the passage of this bill in the interests and for the benefit of American consumers and for the producers of these perishable commodities that make up a large percentage of the diet of the American people.

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMPSON].

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to answer some questions that were specifically asked of Texas Members, and also to try to clear up some misunderstandings that seem to have been left with the Committee.

In the first place, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY] asked how the wetback situation is affected by this law. It has corrected it to a very considerable extent, but it will never stop all illegal entry over any border. However, it is in much better shape now than it has ever been. I know the situation in the lower Rio Grande. I talked with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. REGAN] and the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. PATTEN]. I think you will find that is true all along the Mexican border, that this has gone further to stop the wetback problem than anything we have ever attempted.

Something was said about, "Why not hire American labor?" The reason is there is none available to do that type of stoop labor. Anyone who is familiar with either the agricultural problem or the labor situation in this country will recognize the truth of that. If we had available the American labor we would not need this legislation.

As to why the legislation should be temporary; a 3-year extension rather than an indefinite bill: The reason is that we hope the situation is temporary. Surely there is one reason for the emergency, that no one has touched on. There is a war going on, and the young Americans are going into the armed services, even though they might get exemption. That is one reason why it is so acute down in our country. The young fellows have gone to war. We hope that will not always be the case.

With reference to a 3-year extension, it takes quite a lot of machinery to set this in motion. If we try to do it from year to year it breaks down. The continuity is not there. The people on the other side of the border and on this side do not know just how to proceed. Three years is the lowest figure that we felt was workable. That is why we took that period instead of a 1-year extension.

Let me stress this fact: In opposing this legislation there is always reference to wetbacks. The workers who enter under this bill are not wetbacks at all. They are legal entrants into this country, temporary it is true.

It has been suggested that they are not screened. That is not true at all. They are screened twice, once in Mexico, and then they are brought to the border and screened on this side; screened from the standpoint of loyalty, as best we can screen them, and of course from the standpoint of health. No farmer in this country wants Mexicans or anyone else who is not able to do a day's work. So, of course, they are screened from all these points of view.

I think that answers some of the misapprehensions that are in the minds of some few Members in this body. I do hope you will pass the bill as it is. It has been carefully thought out in the Committee on Agriculture; it has worked, and we believe that it will continue to work.

(Mr. THOMPSON of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, my colleagues of the House will remember that I vigorously opposed this legislation when it was up for enactment in original form. I predicated my opposition largely on economic grounds. I attacked the proposed estimates of cost. I think the figures given by the gentleman from Minnesota have proved conclusively that my contentions were right, that it would be a considerable burden on the Treasury of the United States. I note that the appropriation alone for the bureau of the Department of Labor handling this bill asks for \$2,600,000. That is far in excess of the estimates offered by the proponents of this legislation at the time it was enacted.

I opposed it also on the further economic ground that the Mexican laborers brought into this country were exempted from the operation of the income-tax laws. All Americans must pay taxes on their incomes, but these migrant workers are exempt from our income-tax laws; they are even given workmen's compensation payments, in fact, they are put into a special category over and above that given to the American workers. I attacked it on the ground that it was unfair because of these exemptions.

I think, Mr. Chairman, we should give careful attention to this matter; and if this legislation is to be reenacted I am of the opinion that we should reenact it for a period less than that proposed in the bill before us. I am interested in calling the attention of the membership to the fact that the Assistant Secretary of Labor appearing before your committee—and I have his testimony here—recommended an extension of this legislation to December 31, 1954, not a 3-year extension. His plea was predicated on the fact that the situation was such that further study was necessary of the operation of this legislation, and he thought that changes might have to be made; so he asked only and recommended only an extension to December 31, 1954.

I want to assure you, Mr. Chairman, that when the bill is read for amendment, an amendment will be offered to carry out the wishes of the administration and the wishes of the Department of Labor as to the time limit set in this bill.

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KING].

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, going back to the wetback problem, I think there should be just one explanation made as to the effect of this bill on this problem. Actually this bill authorizes our Labor Department to negotiate with the Mexican Government for the use of their labor; and, therefore, it is necessary for us to work out with them the terms of the actual contracts executed.

The rules under which these men are employed are not altogether satisfactory to the Texas employers. There are many things about the contract they would like to improve, but first it must be recognized that Mexico has something to say about this problem. What

have they said that affects this wetback situation? They have said that the recruiting point, the assembling point, for this labor coming in under the present arrangement shall be 900 miles down in Mexico; so that if a Mexican living just across the Rio Grande decides he wants to come into Texas to work, he finds himself faced with a trip 900 miles down into Mexico and 900 miles back. It becomes much easier to just sneak across the border.

If we were able to stipulate all of the terms of this arrangement ourselves, probably it would have a very beneficial effect upon the wetback problem, but not being able to do that, we must recognize that Mexico has an interest in the matter and for her own good stipulates that the labor be taken out of the deep interior rather than from the territory just immediately across the border.

This bill, of course, is necessary now to perpetuate a scheme of production which has existed in this country in certain sections since the start of the industry. Texas vegetable and fruit crops have depended from the beginning of their existence upon Mexican labor.

It is true that the Government has injected regulation into this problem that has become quite expensive. It seems to me it should be handled much cheaper. I know that it could be made much cheaper on the employers if there were fewer regulations which exact costly things from the employers. That, however, is perhaps beside the point except to explain how the thing actually works.

This legislation should be extended because it is necessary to maintain a high level of production in the fruit and vegetable industry. On the basis of the regulations provided, we may be able to work out something that will satisfactorily solve the immigration problem.

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HOWELL].

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I am interested in this legislation. I represent a district in New Jersey that is pretty well balanced. We have a lot of industry and a considerable amount of agriculture, mostly family farms, such as dairy, poultry, truck, fruit, and so forth. Some of our fruit farmers do have a need many times for migratory or transient labor although I do not think this bill will do anything directly for them. However, I am sincerely interested in the problems of agriculture, even in agriculture beyond my district.

The necessity for a balanced, healthy agricultural economy is pretty basic to our whole economy, perhaps even to the situation that prevails in the world today.

I think farmers and agriculture in general have some unusual problems which other segments of our population do not have, and I think in many cases they need some special consideration and treatment of some of their problems and needs.

I have always been interested and anxious to help them to the best extent we can, in all fairness to the rest of our population. I think there also is a situa-

tion where probably agriculture, or what in some cases amounts almost to industry under the guise of agriculture, gets out of a lot of its social responsibility to its workers in particular. I say all this knowing that these problems do exist and that we cannot apply all of our Federal and State laws requiring additional expenditures and additional responsibilities to agriculture in the same way that we can to industry and other better organized segments of our economy which do not have the same problems. But it seems to me that the large industrialized type of agriculture enterprises could begin to accept some of these responsibilities. They get out of collective bargaining; they get out of old-age benefits; they get out of unemployment compensation. They get some special concessions in the child labor laws and do a lot of things that we like to apply to the rest of the people of our country, and for good and sufficient reasons in many cases we grant exemptions to agriculture and make a very broad definition of agriculture in granting those exemptions.

So it does seem to me that it is time for the kind of agriculture which in the main is affected by this legislation to begin to try to exercise some of that social responsibility and to improve working conditions in that segment of agriculture that is not like the family-type farm to a very great extent but is really a highly mechanized and industrialized operation. I realize that they do need temporary influxes of migratory labor or some form of extra seasonal labor or they could not get their crops to market to help feed the country, and in some cases the rest of the world.

I think this act that we are presently contemplating extending, and I admit this somewhat reluctantly, should be extended. I would much prefer to see it extended for a temporary period of 1 year or something in the nature of a temporary extension rather than either an indefinite extension or a 3-year extension which also has been talked about. I think if we go ahead and proceed on that basis and give them some time to deal with the problems that they have, and then put a little bit of the onus on them to make some of the working conditions in these areas more attractive to American citizens, give them a little better wage, give them better working hours, give them better living conditions, and some of the things that other American labor gets either through the strength of their union organizations or for other economic conditions that prevail in other lines of endeavor—that gradually they will be able to find that they can get more easily the needed labor supply.

As I said before, I am probably going to vote for an extension of this act. I hope that it will be a temporary or limited extension and I sincerely hope that these people who need this migratory labor, who need both the legitimate and the wetback labor that travels down in that area, will do something through their own efforts to make this kind of work more attractive to American workers and help to improve conditions so that they will not have to come back to us a year or 2 years from now and ask

for this same special consideration that we are about to vote to them today. I feel very strongly about that, in all fairness I do want to deal with it properly, but I do hope that it will be a temporary extension and that the farmers who are benefitting from this program will exert some responsibility on their own to improve these conditions.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOWELL. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I would think the gentleman would be concerned about the consumer angle of this, because it takes this type of labor which is unavailable in this country to produce an abundance of fruits and vegetables to supply the consumers of the country.

Mr. HOWELL. I am concerned about it, and I am not at all anxious to pay a lot more for my food, but if I have to pay a little more I might enjoy that food a little better than I enjoy it knowing that it was produced by underpaid workers working under very poor conditions. I think we just have to face some of these things.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman is an unusual character when he speaks that way.

Mr. HOWELL. I hope I am not that unusual.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOWELL. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I am sure the gentleman is disturbed, as many of us are, that we find ourselves in the very strange position of drafting American boys off the farm to fight our wars all over the world and at the same time bringing in people from outside our country to do the work of our farm boys.

Mr. HOWELL. I am glad the gentleman brought that up. The draft boards up in my district have not been very generous in granting proper and really necessary exemptions for agriculture under the Selective Service Act. We do have situations where they are taking boys off the farms and then bringing in people from Mexico to do that kind of work.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOWELL. I yield.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. The reason why this is temporary legislation, as I tried to point out a little while ago, is that the need is only temporary. However, during the 3-year period you can go right ahead with permanent legislation if you think it is necessary. We hope it will not be, and that by the end of that time our own boys will be back and at the farm work that they left to go to war.

There is another thing the gentleman brought out, about getting American labor to do the job. Our experience is that no matter what you pay, the American worker who can get a job in a factory or somewhere else is not inclined to do the stoop labor this bill would provide.

Mr. HOWELL. I know that that exists, and I hope it can be improved by improv-

ing the working conditions, paying the men a more liberal wage, and making that type of endeavor more attractive to them. I realize that it cannot be done quickly, and it is not as easy as it sounds, but I do hope we can work out something better than this to take care of the situation in the long run.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

(Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I have taken this time to address a question to the chairman of the committee. I have been recently in Puerto Rico, where I made a Lincoln Day speech, and had a chance to look over conditions on the island. They have a large amount of surplus workers, many of them agricultural workers. In New York City we have had a movement from Puerto Rico of roughly 50,000 a year for the last few years and housing conditions as well as economic opportunity should certainly be opened up throughout the country for these hard-working citizens who have come to the mainland to seek greater opportunity.

May I ask the gentleman whether any real effort has been made to seek to employ these American workers with excellent agricultural skills for this kind of work?

Mr. HOPE. Yes, I may say to the gentleman there have been efforts to recruit Puerto Ricans and there have been efforts to secure American labor here on the mainland, as far as that is concerned.

I refer to the testimony of Mr. Mashburn, the Under Secretary of Labor, before the committee, in which, after enumerating some of the things that are being done to meet the far labor situation, he said:

We have made special efforts to place American Indians, to contract Puerto Ricans, and to use volunteer farm placement representatives in areas which cannot support regular employment offices.

I also have a letter from Mr. Robert C. Goodwin who is in charge of the Farm Placement Service of the Department of Labor in which he makes the same statement. In enumerating some 10 different methods which the Farm Placement Service has tried to meet this situation without using Mexican labor he says among these things, "by contracting Puerto Ricans for agricultural employment before they are transported to the mainland." I believe I am safe in saying that if it were possible to get Puerto Ricans to come in to do this work and go into the areas where this labor is needed that that type of labor would be preferred to the Mexican labor because then we would not have to meet all of the conditions that have been imposed by the Mexican Government before they permit Mexican laborers to come into this country.

Mr. JAVITS. Does the gentleman feel it is low wage scales and working conditions as compared with those elsewhere on the mainland which keep away

the Puerto Rican worker or does the gentleman feel that they just do not want to work in that area. After all, they do need rewarding work, that is evident by the conditions of the movement from Puerto Rico.

Mr. HOPE. I do not think it is the low wage scale because for this type of work I do not think the wages are low. In any event, under our contract with Mexico and under the law the Mexican contract labor must be paid the prevailing wage. Undoubtedly the Puerto Ricans would be able to secure at least the prevailing wage in the areas from which they come and in the areas along the east coast where the Puerto Ricans have been brought in, they come in under contract where the wages are made a part of the contract.

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. It is true that we should look here in the East particularly to Puerto Rican labor rather than Mexican labor covered by this bill. I, too, have just returned from Puerto Rico and have had considerable experience in the handling of Puerto Rican labor. I would like to say that we would be employing more Puerto Ricans and Puerto Rico could send to this country one of its greatest resources other than sugar, to a greater degree, if it were not for the attitude of the Puerto Rican department of labor with respect to this matter. This spring, speaking for the eastern employers of Puerto Rican labor, we got into a conflict over the terms of the contract which they demanded. Of course, in sending to us Puerto Ricans who are citizens there is nothing they can give to us in the way of a contract guaranteeing any service whatsoever. The Puerto Ricans can leave employment the day after they arrive. On the other side, they have demanded what we consider excessive terms, terms as has been charged in this whole labor movement, which go beyond the offer that we make to native labor. I am happy to say that within the last few days we think that difficulty with the Puerto Rican labor department is being resolved and I am hoping in a conference which we will have tomorrow to arrive at a final agreement satisfactory both to Puerto Rico and to the eastern employers.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. We have found this situation out in our section of the country. We would like to have Puerto Rican laborers but for some reason or other they all like to go to New York or Chicago. Probably you treat them so well there that they do not care to be out in the Midwest to do this type of work.

Mr. JAVITS. We treat them no better and no worse than other citizens, but there are many inducements which would make it attractive for such citizens to get jobs around the country, especially because of the difficult housing conditions to which they are subjected.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. HOEVEN. I think it should be pointed out that the Puerto Rican laborer can come and go as he sees fit. There are no restrictions on him, he being an American citizen. I was very interested in the gentleman's comment or in his inquiry, rather, as to whether or not the low-wage scale in the stoop labor field would not deter these people from coming over. I do not think that is the case at all, because it is my understanding that in the coffee areas of Puerto Rico their wage scale is about 18 cents an hour. Their daily labor scale is approximately 30 or 40 cents an hour, and skilled labor is 60 cents an hour. So that it should be an inducement for them to come over, when they can get as good as they see fit.

Mr. JAVITS. That is exactly my point. This discussion bears out the validity of the fact that this ought to be a 1-year extension; that we ought to do better on our domestic labor supply than we have done. The worker from Puerto Rico must make a comparison with what he can earn elsewhere on the mainland, not in Puerto Rico.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUNTER. Apropos of the remarks of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN], the Mexican nationals are being paid 85 cents an hour in California. In addition to that, they receive free housing and free utilities. I would not think from that that they were being paid slave labor wages.

Mr. JAVITS. We ought to do a better job in utilizing our domestic workers, including those from Puerto Rico.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 509 of title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by striking out "December 31, 1953" and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1956."

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BAILEY: On page 1, line 5, strike out "December 31, 1956" and insert "December 31, 1954."

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I predicate this amendment on the testimony offered by the Under Secretary of Labor, Lloyd A. Mashburn, who appeared before the Senate Committee on Agriculture on March 23 in connection with this proposed extension of Public Law No. 78. He started his testimony as follows:

It may be well for me to emphasize at the beginning of this testimony the policy of the Department of Labor. This policy has been, and will continue to be, to make intensified

efforts to fill our farm-labor needs from all available domestic sources.

It is plain that the Department of Labor considers this being emergency legislation, temporary legislation, and that they are not interested in it as legislation as such, but only as a stopgap to take care of a situation due to existing shortages in the availability of American labor.

I am not going to belabor the question by offering some of his arguments. However, I again quote from Mr. Mashburn:

As to the question of extending or revising Public Law 78, I am sure that the committee appreciates that we are a new administration which has assumed office about 2 months ago. We have had little opportunity to observe the operation of the program under the present law. We know full well that there have been conflicting views on various aspects of the program. We are also convinced that an extension of the present law is needed. We believe it would be most desirable, however, for us to have an opportunity to look into the various phases of the program during the coming crop season so that we can be in a position to determine where the problem areas are and to evaluate the conflicting views which have been expressed by those concerned with the program. We feel that, having had such an opportunity, we could then determine what remedial steps, if any, can be taken administratively and whether or not substantive amendments to Public Law 78 would be desirable. For these reasons we recommend a simple extension of Public Law 78 to December 31, 1954. I believe that this period will give enough time for us to develop, and for Congress to consider, our recommendations for a course of action for the future.

I am predicating my amendment on the basis of the recommendation of the people who are administering this law, and I assume he is speaking for the present national administration.

Let me say in conclusion that everybody concerned, even the proponents of this bill, say it is temporary legislation. Why, then, do we need a life of 3 years when the situation may be such at the end of December 1954 that we will not have further need for the legislation? I sincerely hope that my colleagues of the House will not only be consistent with the Department of Agriculture but will also be consistent with the new administration.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I hope the Committee will not adopt the amendment just offered by the gentleman from West Virginia.

The committee very carefully considered the question of how long this legislation should be continued. We had several witnesses before the committee, representing farm organizations and users of this labor. They recommended that the law be extended indefinitely. We had others who suggested that it be extended 3 years as provided by the bill now before us.

It is true that the distinguished Under Secretary of Labor suggested an extension of 1 year. The committee considered that carefully. The principal reason he gave was that he thought it might be easier to deal with the Mexican Government if we had a 1-year extension. I want to call attention to the fact, how-

ever, that the Under Secretary also made the following statement. He said:

I want to be honest and say that the administrators of the program recommend a 3-year extension instead of a 1-year extension. Their reasons are sound, that it is much more difficult for them to administer a program where it is set up year to year than where it is set up for 3 years. But we have felt that the leverage in negotiating the new agreement was such that under 1-year conditions it was so much better than 3-year conditions. We disagreed with the administrator. Now, maybe we are wrong again; it is a matter of judgment.

The committee felt that there was much to be said for the position of those who were administering the act in that it gives us a program under which we can know from one year to the next what the producers of the country can depend upon in the way of agricultural labor from this source. That was also the viewpoint of the users of the labor who appeared before the committee, including all the general farm organizations. I am sure that is not only in the interest of the producers but also in the interest of the consumers of this country.

Then I want to call attention to one other point that I think is a complete answer to the proposal of the gentleman from West Virginia, and that is that this law will not be put into effect unless and until the Secretary of Labor finds three things: First, that sufficient domestic workers who are able, willing, and qualified are not available at the time and place needed to perform the work for which such workers are employed; second, that the employment of such workers will not adversely affect the wages or working conditions of domestic agricultural workers; and third, that reasonable efforts have been made to hire domestic workers at such wages and standard hours and working conditions as apply to the foreign workers. Unless all those conditions exist this law will not be called into effect; it will simply be there to be used if necessary.

So taking all of those conditions into consideration the committee unanimously voted to extend the act for 3 years. I sincerely hope this committee will go along with the Committee on Agriculture on this point.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. GATHINGS. Public Law 78 of the 82d Congress, 1st session, was passed by both Houses of Congress in the summer of 1951. That is the act we are attempting to extend for 3 years. This legislation was approved on July 12, 1951, and gave the farmers in the 23 States who contract for this labor the privilege of using migrant labor in the harvesting of their crops for 3 years: for the years 1951, 1952, and 1953. So what is already on the statute books practically amounts to a 3-year term, although it was approved in July 1951, and would extend until December 31, 1953.

Mr. HOPE. In other words, what the gentleman is saying is that the present law covers 3 crop years and we are extending it for another 3 crop years.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, one of the most significant statements on this bill, in my opinion, was made by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] who said in substance that this legislation is necessary because selective service has stripped the farms of Nebraska of necessary labor.

Mr. Chairman, the Republic of Mexico, a member of the United Nations, has not contributed a single combat soldier to the fighting in Korea, not one, so far as I know, and I had the records checked just a few moments ago. I opposed similar legislation on that ground when it was before the House last year and I am opposed to it now.

I am opposed to this business of shipping American boys 7,000 miles across the Pacific to fight and die on Old Baldy, and then import laborers into this country from Mexico to take up the slack. I simply do not go along with that sort of procedure.

I am opposed to this bill. I will vote for the pending amendment to limit it to 1 year, and then vote against the bill altogether.

I assume that Mexico voted in the United Nations for the war in Korea. If there is to be fighting and dying, if there is to be warfare in this world to which Mexico subscribes, let that country send its boys to Korea, too.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, in answer to the inquiry propounded by our distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. JAVITS] may I say that the reason why Puerto Rican labor does not get into the areas now overrun with the so-called wetbacks is because of the fact that wages are suppressed in those areas. Minimum wage laws are in effect nonexistent. Social-security benefits are not recognized. Pensions are out the window.

Let me read to you a paragraph from the report of the President's Commission on Migratory Labor:

The wetback is a hungry human being. His need of food and clothing is immediate and pressing. He is a fugitive and it is as a fugitive that he lives. Under the constant threat of apprehension and deportation, he cannot protest or appeal no matter how unjustly he is treated. Law operates against him but not for him. Those who capitalize on the legal disability of the wetbacks are numerous and their devices are many and various.

That is the reason, I say to the gentleman from New York, that the Puerto Ricans fail to go to those areas. If they did they would have to compete with these wetbacks. They refuse to subscribe and embrace the damaging conditions obtaining.

Our source of migratory labor is not only Puerto Rico and the Republic of Mexico, we recruit these workers from Canada, we recruit them from the British West Indies.

I support the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia so

that ample time may be afforded to go into these questions. In a year we can come up with solutions to this problem of migrant labor. We have only touched the periphery of this very vexatious problem. We have not plumbed the depths. The argument was made that the Judiciary Committee had developed a comprehensive code on immigration. That is true. The question was propounded, Why did not the Subcommittee on Immigration of the Committee on the Judiciary go into this matter? We did go into the matter. We devised a section which provides that it shall be unlawful to conceal, harbor or shield any alien who is not lawfully in the country. But we left out the word "hires," which is the nub of the situation. We have failed to put into that fabric of the immigration code the word "hires." Anybody can hire these people, here, legally or illegally. The employers of these wetbacks in many instances feel they have a sort of God-given right to hire wetbacks, to hire those who come in illegally. Resolutions have been actually passed by chambers of commerce in localities along the Mexican border. Those resolutions say that farmers and ranchers have traditional, inherent rights to hire illegals and no authority is going to interfere with them. They have exercised great power. Their influence prevented us from including the word "hires" in the aforesaid statute. They thus can "hire" at will anyone—be he here illegally or legally.

Now, the Committee on the Judiciary will have to go into that problem again. They need time to do that. One year is enough. We do not need 3 years. There is no reason, therefore, why we should extend this statute, with all its attendant abuses, for a period of 3 years. I am very anxious to help the farmers, just as are all the members of the committee on Agriculture, including the distinguished chairman. I want the vegetables and I want the cotton and I want the fruit picked. It is essential to get workers to pick that productivity, but I want those workers brought in in a decent, legal fashion. That is not the case now. I am willing to accept the abuses that have been pointed out for 1 more year, but I do not want to go beyond that. Laws called temporary have a habit of becoming permanent, and the longer the temporary period the greater the temptation to extend those statutes into perpetuity.

It is said the Agriculture Committee cannot concern itself with the immigration aspects. That is a faulty approach. Here agriculture and immigration are intertwined and related. They are joined like the obverse and reverse sides of a coin. You cannot consider in this instance the one without the other.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. With due deference to the report from which the gentleman just read, which indicates that the reason Puerto Ricans do not go into these short labor agriculture areas is because of the low wages, the report is in

error. I was in Puerto Rico last week with Members of the Committee on Agriculture. I was in the coffee region of the island, and we were informed that the coffee workers in Puerto Rico were paid 18 cents an hour, and that is all. I am certain that there is not an agricultural area in the United States which is paying any low wage of that kind or character.

Mr. CELLER. All I did was to quote what the President's Commission gave us. The report did not conclude that Puerto Ricans do not go into wetback areas for the reasons assigned. I concluded that.

Mr. ABERNETHY. They are in error.

Mr. CELLER. Well, that may be, but I must say that I have confidence in them. We, in New York, are plagued with this problem. We have vast numbers making the trek from Puerto Rico to New York City and its environs, creating many difficult sociological and political problems. No committee of Congress has adequately gone into that situation nor have they gone into the situation adequately with reference to Canadian and Caribbean migratory labor.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. In the first place, I am with the gentleman on the 1-year extension, and I shall vote the same way. I would like to ask the gentleman whether he can tell us the difference, legally, between what has been said here that the Puerto Rican worker can leave, if he wants to, and the Mexican worker cannot if he wants to, and what is the practical effect of this regulation under which he comes in making him work even if he does not want to work?

Mr. CELLER. If he is what is called a wetback and is here illegally, he is not likely to leave. He is almost—I do not like to use the word—chained onto that farm, because the farmer who employs him has a whip over him in the sense that if he leaves the farmer will disclose to the authorities that he is a wetback, and in that sense he is in a serious disadvantage to the Puerto Rican. The wetback dare not leave no matter how low the wages or burdensome the conditions of employment. The wetback can thus be blackmailed into submission. He is helpless. Many take undue advantage of this helplessness.

Mr. JAVITS. Therefore, the virtue of the bill is it regulates the conditions under which he is held, and certainly we should not continue that situation for a day longer than we have to. So I thoroughly agree with the gentleman that it should not be for more than 1 year.

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. The reason that Puerto Ricans do not get into the western district is purely a matter of transportation cost, and it is not true that the wages paid in California and Texas are lower than are paid by the agriculture industry in the eastern sec-

tion that does employ Puerto Ricans. It is purely a matter of transportation cost.

Mr. CELLER. Extend for 1 year. During that period the entire question might well be canvassed and all the bugs in the law can be removed. Do not extend beyond 1 year. If after 1 year more time is essential, it will be a simple matter to extend for 1 more year.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

The question was taken; and the Chairman being in doubt, the Committee divided and there were—ayes 41, noes 70.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. BAILEY and Mr. HOPE.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 50, noes 114.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it seems evident that the House will quickly approve the pending resolution which would extend for an additional 3-year period the present law with respect to the importation of agricultural labor from the Republic of Mexico. The present statute is by no means fully adequate, but it appears that, as a practical proposition, there is no present opportunity to secure approval of any significant changes. Under the circumstances, I am supporting the pending resolution as the most practical approach to a very difficult agricultural farm-labor problem.

I know from firsthand experience about the trials and tribulations of the farmers who have sought to utilize agricultural labor from the Republic of Mexico. They have been confronted with an agreement with the Republic of Mexico which has been quite one-sided in favor of Mexico. Last fall, in my own congressional district, we had a problem of the most serious nature involving the establishment of the prevailing wage for the pulling of cotton. At one time thousands of farmers were confronted with a rather disastrous possibility of having to pay for cotton pulling at a higher rate on a retroactive basis. Through the efforts and cooperation of the Under Secretary of Labor and members of his staff, this problem was to a very considerable degree adjusted. We cannot afford to have a repetition of the uncertainties and difficulties which we had with this legislation during the 1952 crop year. I want to express the hope that those who administer the program in 1953 will be able to work closely with the agricultural producer and formulate a policy that will be reasonably fair and satisfactory to all concerned.

One of our principal agricultural difficulties arises out of the shortage of agricultural labor. The present measure is not fully satisfactory, but it seems that it represents the best we are able to get at this time. I hope the House will approve the pending resolution. I was pleased that the amendment which had

restricted the extension to 1 year was defeated.

(Mr. MAHON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McCARTHY: On page 1, after line 5, add the following: That title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by adding a new section, section 503, as follows:

"SEC. 503. (a) Any employer who contracts employees under the terms of this title for the planting, cultivating, and/or harvesting of crops for which the employer receives payments under title III of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, or which are supported at 90 percent of parity under the terms of the preceding titles of this act, and who also employs citizens of the United States for the same work on such crops, shall pay to such citizens of the United States so employed an hourly wage at least equal to 90 percent of the basic minimum wage provided for by the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended.

"(b) No workers shall be made available under this title to, nor shall any workers made available under this title be permitted to remain in the employ of any employer who violates the provisions of paragraph (a) of this section."

And renumber the sections which follow accordingly.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is not germane to the bill under consideration.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, does not the point of order come too late?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Minnesota desire recognition?

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I thought I had been recognized.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas makes a point of order against the amendment. Does the gentleman from Minnesota seek recognition on the point of order?

Mr. McCARTHY. No, Mr. Chairman; I will await the ruling of the Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Kansas state his point of order?

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is not germane to the bill under consideration. It is an attempt to deal with matters entirely outside the purview of this legislation, legislation which would properly come within the jurisdiction of another committee. It attempts to fix wages and deal with matters that come within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Labor. It might properly be an amendment to the Fair Labor Standards Act, but not to this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

The amendment proposes to bring in a new class not contemplated in the bill. Therefore the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, of course I accept the ruling of the Chair, but I think we all know that the basic act we are amending

dealt with the problem of fair labor standards and the act of 1938. I had hoped that the proponents of this bill might accept my amendment without objection, because it seems to me so eminently fair to provide simply, as my amendment does, that any American citizen who is employed in the planting, cultivation, or harvesting of crops which are subsidized under the Sugar Act, which are supported at 90 percent of parity, ought to receive 90 percent of the minimum wage of 75 cents an hour. It seems to me that no one should object to having those employees receive 90 percent of the minimum wage. That is the simple proposition in my amendment.

As I say, I think my amendment should have been accepted unanimously, but it has been ruled out of order on a point. I do hope that the Committee on Agriculture will see fit to bring in, when next this legislation is before the Congress, a bill which will at least permit us to make some attempt to solve the problem of the domestic American migratory worker of the United States of America.

I do hope that this amendment will be remembered by that committee as a constructive suggestion.

I yield back the remainder of my time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, as I became a Member of this body on January 3, I resolved never to solicit the privilege of the floor unless a bill was being considered upon which I thought I could make a definite contribution. I feel that I do know something about this problem, and so rise in support of the bill. I am a farmer raising row crops, such as sugar beets, lettuce, and other types of vegetables in central California. I am an employer of Mexican nationals, whom I hire in accordance with the agreement between the United States and Mexico. I would like to talk about this because, as I said, I feel I know something about it.

Before speaking on this question, I would like to reach a definition of terms, because it appears to me there is confusion here regarding terms.

In the first place, we hear the word "wetback" used very, very loosely. To us in central California, who employ migratory laborers, a wetback is a person who has gained his entry into the United States illegally. The man who is working under contract as the result of a treaty between the United States and Mexico we call a national. So, when I refer to the people that I hire, I am referring to nationals. I am not referring to wetbacks; and this bill, as I understand it, is not concerned with wetbacks.

The inference has been made that these nationals are cheap labor and that they are underpaid. It has also been inferred that we hire them in order to keep from paying the domestic laborer the amount that he deserves to be paid.

In order to answer this, I would like to give you one example from my own experience. Last year I had entered an order for Mexican nationals for use on

my ranch. I canceled the order at the last minute because I was able to secure domestic labor. All of us in central California, and I think throughout the entire State of California, exhaust every possibility for hiring local labor before we hire Mexican nationals, because the Mexican nationals cost us more money. We pay 85 cents an hour to the local laborer. We pay 85 cents an hour to the national, but the national costs us transportation, bond, housing, and the amount that we pay to the association which hires them for us, usually 10 percent of 85 cents an hour. Mexican nationals, all things considered, cost us about \$1 per hour. So the Mexican national is not cheap labor. On the contrary, he is expensive. That is why we exhaust every possible means of getting local labor first. In fact, the Mexican national is the last resort, and we want that last resort available to us in the event of an emergency. Therefore, I urge your favorable vote on the bill before the House.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUBSER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. I offer my hearty compliments to the gentleman, as I see he thoroughly understands the problem. I am not a farmer, but I have lived in the San Joaquin Valley for over 30 years. As you have well pointed out, these Mexican nationals cost more money for what they do in the fields of California than the Americans, because we give them all these privileges, mentioned by my colleague. Furthermore, Stockton, where I live, is the center for the recruitment of farm labor. It is utterly impossible for many of the ranchers who raise these row crops, like asparagus and onions, and tree and vine crops, to get American labor. They want American labor, but we simply cannot get enough of them to work on these fabulous farms. There are over 100 specialized crops raised in California which are sent to all parts of the United States.

Mr. GUBSER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUBSER. I yield.

Mr. HUNTER. I, too, wish to commend the gentleman from California for his straightforward and enlightening statement on this subject. The condition he describes prevails also in the San Joaquin Valley of California, part of which I represent. The farmer does not use Mexican nationals except as a last resort. I believe last year in the San Joaquin Valley some 3,200 were used. It is very possible that this year none will be needed at all.

I am very glad the gentleman has stated the situation in such a clear and concise way as he has.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUBSER. I yield.

Mr. GATHINGS. I want to commend the gentleman for a very fine statement. Let me say that in the State of Arkansas we have to transport our labor about 1,200 miles north of the border and it is an additional cost to us. The gentleman has stated the case exactly as it is.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3480) to amend section 509 of title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, to extend for 3 years the period during which agricultural workers may be made available for employment under such title, pursuant to House Resolution 204, he reported the same back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GROSS) there were—ayes 133, noes 28.

Mr. HAYES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and seventy-nine Members are present, not a quorum.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the role.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 259, nays 87, answered "present" 1, not voting 84, as follows:

[Roll No. 23]

YEAS—259

Abbott	Chatham	Goodwin
Abernethy	Chelf	Graham
Adair	Chenoweth	Grant
Albert	Clevenger	Gregory
Alexander	Cole, Mo.	Gubser
Allen, Ill.	Cole, N. Y.	Hagen, Calif.
Andersen,	Condon	Hagen, Minn.
H. Carl	Coon	Hale
Andresen,	Cooper	Haley
August H.	Cotton	Halleck
Andrews	Cretella	Hand
Angell	Crumpacker	Harden
Arends	Curtis, Mass.	Hardy
Aspinall	Curtis, Mo.	Harrison, Nebr.
Auchincloss	Dague	Harrison, Wyo.
Ayres	Davis, Ga.	Harvey
Barden	Davis, Wis.	Hays, Ark.
Bates	Deane	Herlong
Battle	Devereux	Hess
Beamer	D'Ewart	Hiestand
Becker	Dies	Hill
Belcher	Dondero	Hillelson
Bender	Donohue	Hillings
Bennett, Fla.	Dorn, S. C.	Hoeven
Bentley	Dowdy	Hoffman, Mich.
Berry	Doyle	Holmes
Betts	Edmondson	Holt
Boggs	Ellsworth	Hope
Bolton,	Engle	Horan
Frances P.	Evins	Howell
Bonner	Fernandez	Hunter
Bosch	Fino	Hyde
Bramblett	Fisher	Ikard
Brooks, La.	Ford	Jackson
Brooks, Tex.	Forrester	Jarman
Brown, Ga.	Fountain	Jenkins
Brownson	Frazier	Johnson
Broyhill	Frelinghuysen	Jonas, Ill.
Budge	Gamble	Jonas, N. C.
Busbey	Gary	Jonas, Ala.
Bush	Gathings	Jonas, N. C.
Byrnes, Wis.	Gavin	Judd
Camp	Gentry	Kearney
Campbell	George	Kearns
Cannon	Golden	Kilburn
Carlyle		Kilday
Cederberg		King, Pa.

Krueger	Patten
Lalrd	Patterson
Landrum	Pfost
Lantaff	Phillips
Latham	Pilcher
LeCompte	Pillion
Long	Poage
Lovre	Poff
Lucas	Poulson
McCulloch	Preston
McDonough	Rains
McGregor	Ray
McIntire	Rayburn
McMillan	Reams
McVey	Reece, Tenn.
Mack, Wash.	Reed, Ill.
Magnuson	Reed, N. Y.
Mahon	Rees, Kans.
Mailliard	Regan
Martin, Iowa	Rhodes, Ariz.
Mason	Roberts
Matthews	Robeson, Va.
Meader	Robson, Ky.
Merrill	Rogers, Colo.
Metcalf	Rogers, Mass.
Miller, Kans.	Rogers, Tex.
Miller, Md.	Sadlak
Miller, Nebr.	St. George
Miller, N. Y.	Scherer
Mills	Scrivner
Morrison	Scudder
Moss	Seely-Brown
Mumma	Selden
Murray	Shafer
Neal	Sheppard
Nicholson	Short
Norrell	Shuford
Oakman	Sikes
Ostertag	Simpson, Ill.
Passman	Simpson, Pa.
Patman	Small

Smith, Kans.
Smith, Miss.
Smith, Va.
Stauffer
Steed
Stringfellow
Taber
Talle
Teague
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson,
Mich.
Thompson, Tex.
Trimble
Utt
Van Pelt
Van Zandt
Velde
Vinson
Vorys
Vursell
Wainwright
Walter
Wampler
Watts
Westland
Wharton
Whitten
Wickersham
Wickall
Williams, N. Y.
Willis
Wilson, Calif.
Wilson, Ind.
Wilson, Tex.
Winstead
Wolcott
Yorty
Young

NAYS—87

Addonizio	Fogarty	Morgan
Bailey	Forand	Multer
Baker	Friedel	O'Brien, Mich.
Blshop	Garmatz	O'Brien, N. Y.
Blatnik	Green	O'Hara, Ill.
Boland	Gross	O'Neill
Bolling	Hays, Ohio	Osmer
Bonin	Holifield	Perkins
Bow	Holtzman	Polk
Bray	James	Powell
Buchanan	Javits	Price
Burdick	Karsten, Mo.	Radwan
Byrd	Kean	Rhodes, Pa.
Byrne, Pa.	Keating	Riehlman
Canfield	Kee	Rodino
Case	Kelley, Pa.	Saylor
Celler	Kelly, N. Y.	Schenck
Chudoff	Keogh	Sheehan
Crosser	Kersten, Wis.	Shelley
Cunningham	King, Calif.	Sieminski
Dawson, Ill.	Klurwan	Spence
Delaney	Kluczynski	Staggers
Donovan	Lane	Sullivan
Dorn, N. Y.	Lesinski	Sutton
Eberharter	McCarthy	Tollefson
Elliott	Machrowicz	Wier
Fallon	Madden	Wigglesworth
Felghan	Marshall	Withers
Fenton	Mollohan	Withrow

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Moulder

NOT VOTING—84

Allen, Calif.	Gordon	O'Hara, Minn.
Barrett	Granahan	O'Konski
Bennett, Mich.	Gwinn	Pelly
Bentsen	Harris	Philbin
Bolton,	Harrison, Va.	Priest
Oliver P.	Hart	Prouty
Boykin	Hébert	Rabaut
Brown, Ohio	Heller	Richards
Buckley	Heseltan	Riley
Burleson	Hinshaw	Rivers
Carnahan	Hoffman, Ill.	Rogers, Fla.
Carrigg	Hosmer	Rooney
Chiperfield	Hruska	Roosevelt
Church	Hull	Scott
Colmer	Jensen	Secrest
Cooley	Jones, Mo.	Smith, Wis.
Corbett	Klein	Springer
Coudert	Knox	Taylor
Davis, Tenn.	Lanham	Thornberry
Dawson, Utah	Lyle	Warburton
Dempsey	McConnell	Weichel
Derounlan	McCormack	Wheeler
Dingell	Mack, Ill.	Williams, Miss.
Dodd	Marrow	Wolverton
Dollinger	Miller, Calif.	Yates
Dolliver	Morano	Younger
Durham	Nelson	Zablocki
Fine	Norblad	
Fulton	O'Brien, Ill.	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Pelley for, with Mr. Hull against.
Mr. O'Hara of Minnesota for, with Mr. Heselton against.

Mr. Nelson for, with Mr. Bennett of Michigan against.

Mr. Smith of Wisconsin for, with Mr. Klein against.

Mr. Oliver P. Bolton for, with Mr. Buckley against.

Mr. Lanham for, with Mr. Heller against.
Mr. Brown of Ohio for, with Mr. Roosevelt against.

Mr. Rogers of Florida for, with Mr. Gordon against.

Mr. Lyle for, with Mr. Rooney against.
Mr. Cooley for, with Mr. Miller of California against.

Mr. Bentsen for, with Mr. Moulder against.
Mr. Taylor for, with Mr. Dodd against.

Mr. Williams of Mississippi for, with Mr. Dollinger against.

Mr. Dempsey for, with Mr. Dingell against.
Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Fine against.

Mr. Richards for, with Mr. Hart against.
Mr. Riley for, with Mr. Barrett against.

Mr. Rivers for, with Mr. Granahan against.
Mr. Durham for, with Mr. O'Brien of Illinois against.

Mr. Wheeler for, with Mr. Mack of Illinois against.

Mr. Thornberry for, with Mr. Philbin against.

Mr. Burleson for, with Mr. Rabaut against.
Mr. Priest for, with Mr. Yates against.

Mr. Davis of Tennessee for, with Mr. Zablocki against.

Mr. Boykin for, with Mr. Secrest against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Merrow with Mr. Carnahan.
Mr. Allen of California with Mr. Colmer.

Mr. Chipperfield with Mr. Harris.
Mr. Wolverton with Mr. Harrison of Virginia.

Mr. Weichel with Mr. Jones of Missouri.
Mr. Hosmers with Mr. McCormack.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Texas, Mr. BENTSEN. Had he been present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I therefore withdraw my vote and answer "present."

Mr. BOLAND changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE POSTAL DEFICIT

(Mr. FORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, we are all well aware that the United States Post Office Department operates at an annual deficit of hundreds of millions of dollars. Unless postal rates are increased and/or the operations of the Post Office Department made more efficient, the only source of supplementary funds to make up this deficit is, of course, the General Treasury funds. In other words, at the present time as in the past, general taxes of all kinds are used to support the day-to-day operations of the Post Office Department. In the light of this fact, it behooves us who guard the Nation's purse strings, to

adopt every measure which legitimately seeks to make the mail service self-sustaining, and thereby relieve our already overstrained Federal budget.

For this important reason, I am introducing a bill today which will return to the Post Office Department some of its much-needed revenue. I refer specifically to the franking privilege enjoyed by certain Government corporations which claim to be self-supporting. In my judgment, these allegedly profit-making agencies such as the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Bonneville Power Administration, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Inland Waterways Corporation, to mention only a few, inasmuch as they are in competition to a greater or lesser degree with privately owned businesses, should be subject to the same postal regulations as private business.

I have recently read Senate Report No. 2685 which, in effect, bears out my contention that Government agencies in direct competition with private enterprise should be subject to the same regulations. For your own information on this subject, I urge all Members to read this report. Determine if you can the justice of this situation.

In this Senate document which I have just mentioned, the Comptroller General strongly urges the Congress to place these Government-assisted agencies on an equal basis with private enterprise. He finds sufficient cause for such action from the standpoint of good accounting alone.

It seems to me to be strange, indeed, that a legitimate operating or business expense incurred by one of these subsidized agencies would be charged to the Post Office Department, plunging it further into the red. It is unjust and bad bookkeeping as well to force the Post Office Department to bear the burden of agencies which masquerade as profit-making units in the Federal Government. If any or all of these agencies are capable of making a profit for the United States Treasury I am all for it, but there should be no sham or delusion in their operations or their bookkeeping methods.

For example, let us compare the figures of just one of these agencies with those of the Post Office Department.

The Tennessee Valley Authority reported for fiscal year 1952 a net income, after payment of interest, of \$25,100,000. This is indeed a nice profit providing there is no rigged discounting procedure or sizable expenses shunted off to the Post Office Department. The TVA, by having a franking privilege, along with many other agencies made a profit in fiscal year 1952 at the expense of the Post Office Department.

In the same fiscal year 1952, the Post Office Department reported a deficit of \$727,050,218. Part of this deficit resulted from franking costs absorbed from so-called profit-making agencies set up by and operated under the control of the Federal Government.

I maintain that in determining whether a profit has been earned, every agency should be required to list all costs—and this, of necessity, includes mailing expenses.

Therefore, I introduce this legislation to release a number of specified agencies from the franking privilege as one more step in the direction of reorganization and economy. In the spirit of the recommendations proposed by the Hoover Commission, this bill would place responsibilities where they belong.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 5210 OF THE REVISED STATUTES

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 205.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4004) to amend section 5210 of the Revised Statutes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the amendment recommended by the Committee on Banking and Currency now in the bill. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes of my time to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. Speaker, this bill comes from the Committee on Banking and Currency and does away with liability on 16 banks out of 5,000 in the country. This General Liability Act was on the books for a great many years, but recently we have insured the deposits of banks up to \$10,000, therefore it is not necessary for these several banks to carry this double liability. One liability is sufficient. As long as they are taken care of under the \$10,000 insured provision, the Committee on Banking and Currency thought it might be well to pass this bill.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4004) to amend section 5210 of the Revised Statutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4004, with Mr. CUNNINGHAM in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I should apologize to the committee for taking this much time on the present bill because it is a very simple one and is not technical in nature.

At the present time the national banks, of which there are about 4,900, are required about the 1st of July to file a list of their shareholders with the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency. The Office of the Comptroller of the Currency makes no use of this list. The law provides that the president and the cashier of each national banking association shall keep a list up to date and shall make this list available to other shareholders and creditors of the bank. The law does not require that the Comptroller of the Currency make public this list.

Now, this is a practice which has been going on for about 89 years, and was affiliated up to 1933 with a provision in the National Banking Act, which provided for double liability of a shareholder. In the Banking Act of 1933 we provided by law that shares issued after 1933 would no longer be subject to double liability. In 1933, I believe, we passed the Federal Deposit Insurance Act by which we first insured deposits up to \$2,500; then shortly afterwards we insured deposits up to \$5,000; and then in 1950 we amended that so that coverage on insurance was \$10,000. The double liability prior thereto was an additional security. Depositors are, of course, the principal creditors of banks.

In the 1935 act, in addition, when we did away with double liability on outstanding shares, we provided that 10 percent of the net earnings of the banks should be set aside until the earned surplus in reserve was the equivalent of the outstanding common capital stock so we provided in substance and in fact for double protection and required the banks to keep it in surplus so that there would be no question about the solvency of the asset which originally had attended double liability.

This practice after 1937 of filing these reports was continued up to the present time for no purpose whatsoever. It was just one of those things which had been overlooked. Of the four-thousand-nine-hundred-odd banks, of course, they are put to a certain amount of paper work and the Comptroller's office is put to a certain amount of expense and paper work in tabulating these reports, and they find their way into the files and nobody refers to them after that.

In lieu of the annual reports of stockholders to the Comptroller's office we have provided in this bill that the Comptroller can demand a list of shareholders of each and every one of the national banks, which must be verified by the oath of the president or cashier, and that list must be furnished to the Comptroller's office within 10 days after demand. It assures the Comptroller's office that upon demand he can get an up-to-date list for any and all purposes. It is a better procedure than existed under the old law because it enables the Comptroller's office to get an up-to-date list of shareholders. If any liability, which

I cannot imagine exists in addition to their investment in shares, is found, then of course he has his fresh list to do business on.

The committee also found that there were 25 banks in the United States which had not given the notice required under the 1935 act terminating double liability. These are all small banks. So the committee amendment provides that the Comptroller's office shall cause the notice of such prospective termination of double liability to be published, and 6 months after the publication there is no double liability on the part of the 25 out of 4,900 banks that have not given that notice. Whether by oversight or not we do not know why these 25 banks did not publish the notice authorized by law.

I think that is in substance what the bill provides.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. This applies only to 25 banks?

Mr. WOLCOTT. The amendment applies only to 25 banks, the amendment which causes the Comptroller's Office to cause the notice to be published that they are no longer under the double liability.

Mr. GROSS. They were in difficulty because they did not provide it to some agency of Government? What agency was it?

Mr. WOLCOTT. There is no difficulty at all. They have continued double liability because they have never given notice of termination of double liability.

Mr. GROSS. The difficulty arises, then, out of the fact that they did not give notice?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I dare say that in most of the instances it was an oversight. Perhaps they did not know they had to give notice.

Mr. GROSS. This is double liability on the part of the stockholders?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes. We do away with double liability. We did away with double liability in the 1935 act, except with respect to 25 of the 4,900 banks.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. Is the amendment mandatory in that as to these 25 banks the notice shall be published, so that you do not leave it to some bank which possibly through ignorance or for some other reason might fail to get rid of the double liability? You do not leave it to them, but this amendment has the Comptroller take steps so that the double liability will be eliminated after due notice has been given?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes. It is mandatory on the Comptroller of the Currency to publish the notice, and 6 months after the publication of the notice the double liability on the 25 banks will expire, as it has on all the rest of the 4,900 banks.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. WIER. When did you hold hearings on this bill? I have been away during the Easter vacation.

Mr. WOLCOTT. We had 1 day of public hearings and I think 3 days of executive hearings.

Mr. WIER. What generated this amendment?

Mr. WOLCOTT. The Comptroller's Office came down and asked for it.

Mr. WIER. I know there is some opposition to this piece of legislation.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The Acting Comptroller of the Currency came down and testified in favor of it, and then when the new Comptroller of the Currency was confirmed I talked with him and he approved the bill. The Secretary of the Treasury also sent a letter to the Speaker of the House requesting the passage of the bill.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, my interest here is that I know there are some independent banks in my area, at least, that do not look with great favor on this piece of legislation. If it were one of those things where the governmental agency came before the committee and requested this change, I think that change ought to be considered important enough so that all banking circles would have knowledge of this contemplated change.

Mr. WOLCOTT. We knew of the opposition of some of the independent banks, but the committee came to the conclusion that the independent banks were not involved, and if they wanted a list of the shareholders the law provided that the president and cashier of all of the national banks make such list available to the shareholders and creditors.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] has expired.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to get an answer to some questions here.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. WIER. I have heard it said here on the floor that out of the 4,900 chartered banks in this Nation—I think the gentleman from the Committee on Rules said 17 and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] said about 25—that half of them have not applied or have not made known their wishes in signing this waiver, or whatever it is. I do not think that in itself would justify the Comptroller of the Currency thinking that this ought to be changed merely to make it—well, it has already been made.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The committee amendment I refer to in respect to this double liability was not suggested by the Comptroller of the Currency's Office. That was the committee amendment. The Comptroller has no objection to it, however.

Mr. WIER. Suppose this bill came before the House. Those 17 or 25 banks could have done exactly what all the rest of the 4,900 banks have done under the law.

Mr. WOLCOTT. That is right.

Mr. WIER. That is what arouses my curiosity at least.

Mr. WOLCOTT. It may arouse the gentleman's curiosity, but I cannot see



Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued May 8, 1953
For actions of May 7, 1953
83rd-1st, No. 83

CONTENTS

Adjournment.....	16	Flammable fabrics.....	24	Personnel.....	12, 23, 31
Appropriations.....	35	Flood control.....	27	Prices, support.....	30
Budgeting.....	3	Food standards.....	20	Reclamation.....	29
Committees, farm.....	4	Foreign aid.....	6, 34	Retirement.....	23
Commodity Credit Corp.....	5	Forestry.....	2, 7	St. Lawrence seaway.....	26
Contracts.....	13, 21	Insecticides.....	14	Tariff policies.....	33
Cotton.....	1, 11	Interest rates.....	15	Trade, foreign.....	1, 8
Education.....	28	Labor, farm.....	2	Transportation.....	19
Electrification.....	17, 22, 27	Lands, public.....	9, 18	Wheat.....	6
Extension Service.....	2	Legislative program.....	16	Wool imports.....	32
Farm program.....	25	Loans, farm.....	10		

HIGHLIGHTS: Both Houses passed cotton-exports insurance bill. House passed export-control bill. Senate committee voted to report Mexican farm-labor bill and Extension Service consolidation bill. Sen. Humphrey urged farmer-committee system. Sen. Aiken inserted USDA statement on CCC stocks. Sen. Humphrey asked famine relief for Pakistan.

SENATE

- EXPORT INSURANCE.** Both Houses passed H. R. 4465, to authorize the Export-Import Bank to insure exported cotton and other products against war risk. The Senate amended the bill so as to strike out the House provision authorizing such insurance during transit of the commodities to foreign countries (such insurance already being authorized through the Commerce Department). (pp. 4856-65, 4834-6.)
- EXTENSION SERVICE; FARM LABOR; FOREST LAND.** The Agriculture and Forestry Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) S. 1679, to consolidate Extension Service authorizations, and S. 731, to provide for transfer of a tract of forest land at Cherry Point, N. C., to the Navy, without amendment; and H. R. 3480, to extend the period during which Mexican agricultural workers may be made available for employment in this country, with an amendment to provide for a 1-year extension of the program (p. D381).
- BUDGETING.** The "Daily Digest" states that the Reorganization Subcommittee of the Government Operations Committee "ordered favorably reported to the full committee S. 833, to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 by creating a Joint Committee on the Budget, with amendments by Senator McClellan (5-1-53-A) amended so as to provide that the Comptroller General may employ members of professional staff only without regard to civil-service rules, regulations, etc." (p. D383.)
- FARMER COMMITTEES.** Sen. Humphrey urged "perpetuation of the great farmer-elected committee system" for carrying out certain agricultural programs (pp. 4841-4).
- COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION.** Sen. Aiken inserted a letter from the Secretary showing CCC's stock position on fats and oils and dairy products (pp. 4800-4).

6. FOREIGN AID. Sen. Humphrey spoke in favor of "economic assistance to...Pakistan by a loan for the purchase of wheat" and inserted letters from the State and Agriculture Departments on the matter (pp. 4844-5).
7. FORESTRY. Sen. Douglas read a letter from an individual requesting "my share" of national-forest and other Federal resources (p. 4805).

HOUSE

8. EXPORT CONTROL. Passed S. 1739, to extend export-control authority, with an amendment to extend it for 3 years from June 30, 1953, instead of 1 year as provided by the Senate version (pp. 4865-6).
9. PUBLIC LANDS. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported with amendment H. R. 1815, to amend the Recreation Act of 1926 to include other public purposes and to permit nonprofit organizations to lease public lands for certain purposes (H. Rept. 353)(p. 4877).
10. FARM LOANS. The Veterans' Affairs Committee reported with amendment H. R. 4976, to extend to June 30, 1954, the direct home and farmhouse loan authority of the Veterans' Administration under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (H. Rep t. 354)(p. 4877).
11. COTTON. Rep. Gathings spoke on National Cotton Week and the Department's exhibit in the patio of the Administration Building (p. 4852).
12. PERSONNEL. Rep. Broyhill spoke on his resolution to investigate the firing of career Federal employees (pp. 4855-6).
13. CONTRACTS. Received a R. I. Assembly resolution urging repeal of the Fulbright amendment to the Public Contracts Act (p. 4878).
14. INSECTICIDES. Received a Wisconsin Berry and Vegetable Growers Association petition regarding the standards of tolerance for insecticides and fungicides on food crops (p. 4878).
15. INTEREST RATES. Rep. Multer criticized the increase in Government bond interest rates, including its effect on mortgages (pp. 4872-3).
16. ADJOURNED until Mon., May 11 (p. 4876). Legislative program for next week, as announced by Rep. Halleck: Mon., D. C. bills; Tues., tidelands bill; Thurs. and Fri., Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill (pp. 4847, 4852-3).

BILLS INTRODUCED

17. ELECTRIFICATION. S. 1851, by Sen. Murray (for Sen. Lehman), to authorize certain works on the Niagara Falls and River; to Public Works Committee. Remarks of author. (pp. 4797-9.)
18. SUBMARGINAL LANDS. H. R. 5051, by Rep. Chenoweth, to authorize USDA to sell lands acquired under title 3 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act; to Agriculture Committee (p. 4877).
19. TRANSPORTATION. H. R. 5052, to expedite ICC consideration of rate increases; to Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee (p. 4877).
20. FOOD STANDARDS. H. R. 5055, by Rep. Hale, to simplify Food and Drug Administration procedures for establishment of food standards; to Interstate and Foreign

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate passed bill on export insurance.

House passed bills on export insurance and extending export-control authority.

Doctors' military induction bill cleared for House debate by Rules Committee.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 4795-4806

Bills Introduced: Five bills were introduced, as follows: S. 1849 to S. 1853. Page 4797

Bills Reported: Reports were made as follows:

S. 1151, authorizing transfer to State of Tennessee of certain lands in the VA Center, Mountain Home, Tenn. (S. Rept. 228);

H. R. 1334, private bill (S. Rept. 229); and

H. R. 1563, to amend Veterans Regulation No. 2 (a), as amended, to provide that the amount of certain un-negotiated checks shall be paid as accrued benefits upon the death of the beneficiary-payee (S. Rept. 227). Page 4797

Equal Rights—Correction: The DIGEST of yesterday, May 6 (page D374), incorrectly reported passage on call of calendar of S. J. Res. 49, proposing an amendment to the Constitution relative to equal rights for men and women. S. J. Res. 49 actually was objected to and so did not pass.

New Mexico Senatorial Election: Senate debated motion to consider S. Res. 106, authorizing expenditures of \$100,000 by the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections for the investigation of the New Mexico senatorial election campaign, following which the motion was temporarily withdrawn. Pages 4806-4818, 4834

Export Insurance: Senate passed H. R. 4465, to amend the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 by authorizing the bank to utilize up to \$100 million of its existing lending authority to provide a limited type of insurance to American exporters, as amended by Senator Bush so as to except from its provisions goods in transit to any friendly foreign country. The bill was passed after Senate had begun consideration of S. 1413, a companion bill, but it took up H. R. 4465 in lieu thereof.

S. 1413 was then indefinitely postponed. Pages 4834-4836

Additional Judges: Senate made its unfinished business S. 15, to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges. Page 4836

Confirmations: 5 civilian nominations were confirmed, along with 7 in the Army, 27 in the Navy, and 2 in the Marine Corps. Page 4845

Nominations: The nomination of Gen. Nathan F. Twining, to be Chief of Staff of the Air Force, was received, along with that of Lt. Gen. Thomas D. White, to be Vice Chief of Staff of Air Force. Page 4845

Program for Friday: Senate recessed at 6 p. m. until noon Friday, May 8, when it will continue on S. 15, appointment of additional circuit and district judges, to be followed by S. 16, amend immunity provisions relating to testimony by witnesses before Congress or its committees, and S. 922, to create Commission to regulate public transportation by bus and trolley within D. C. area. Following action on these bills, Senate may take up for ratification 3 reported NATO treaties, and for confirmation 10 reported nominations in rank of major general.

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

MEXICAN FARM WORKERS, LAND TRANSFER, AND EXTENSION SERVICE FUNDS

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry: Committee, in executive session, ordered favorably reported the following bills:

Without amendment, S. 731, to authorize the transfer of certain land located at Cherry Point, N. C., and S. 1679, coordination of Agricultural Extension Service appropriations; and

H. R. 3480, to extend the period during which Mexican agricultural workers may be made available for employment in this country, with an amendment to provide for a 1-year extension of the program.

**APPROPRIATIONS—AGRICULTURE
DEPARTMENT**

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Agriculture concluded its hearings on proposed 1954 budget estimates for the Department of Agriculture, with testimony, as indicated, from the following outside witnesses:

On school-lunch program—Harvey K. Allen, representing American School Food Service Association, and New York City Board of Education; Joseph B. Meegan, Back-of-the-Yards Neighborhood Council, Chicago; Mrs. Ada Stough, American Parents' Committee; and Virginia Neel, division of rural service, National Educational Association;

On agricultural research—Leon Singer, Cigar Manufacturers Association of America, Inc.; James G. Patton, Gus Geissler, and John A. Baker, all of National Farmers Union; and F. B. Wise, National Renderers' Association;

On flood prevention and soil conservation—former Representative Fritz Lanham, representing Trinity River Water Shed; former Representative Stephen Pace; Robert M. Koch, National Agricultural Limestone Institute, Inc.; Sam Thompson and Otis Tosset, both of National Association of Soil Conservation Districts; and William E. Welch, National Reclamation Association;

On Forest Service—George A. Duthie, the American Forestry Association; J. Walter Myers, Jr., Forest Farmers' Association Cooperative; D. H. Katz, Ozark Stave Manufacturing Co.; M. W. Santell, of Hodge, La.; Milton Kraft, of Tennessee; and Herman E. Baggenstoss, editor, Grundy County Herald, Tracy City, Tenn.;

On dairy herd improvement—R. F. Loree, Karl B. Musser, and H. W. Norton, Jr., all of Pure Bred Dairy Cattle Association; and

On Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine—Richard P. White, American Association of Nurserymen; and Frank Soraci, Bureau of Entomology, State of New Jersey.

Subcommittee adjourned subject to call.

APPROPRIATIONS—ARMY CIVIL FUNCTIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Continuing its hearings on proposed 1954 budget estimates for Army civil functions, subcommittee heard testimony, as indicated, from the following North Dakota witnesses: Gov. Norman Brunsdale, who made a general statement on flood-control projects; Byron J. Rockwood, Grand Forks, who appeared in behalf of flood-protection works for Grand Forks; Kenneth McIntyre, Harwood, N. Dak., and L. F. Chaffee, of Amenia, both of whom discussed flood-protection improvements on the Rush River; and Fred J. Fredrickson, of Valley City, who represented the Greater North Dakota Association.

Also testifying today were Col. W. D. Milne, River and Harbor Branch of Civil Works Division, Department of Army Engineers, who testified generally on rivers and harbors projects, and Col. Wright Hiatt, Office of Chief of Engineers, Army, whose testimony con-

cerned flood-control projects throughout the country. Hearings continue tomorrow.

APPROPRIATIONS—INTERIOR DEPARTMENT

Committee on Appropriations: Continuing its hearings on H. R. 4828, Interior appropriations for 1954, subcommittee heard testimony in behalf of funds for the Bureau of Reclamation and Bonneville Power Administration from Representative Pfost. Also appearing in behalf of funds for the Bureau of Reclamation were Assistant Commissioners Goodrich W. Lineweaver, Harvey P. McPhail, and Kenneth W. Markwell, accompanied by their associates, all of that Bureau.

Testifying in behalf of funds for the Central Valley project of the Bureau of Reclamation was A. D. Edmonston, executive officer, California Water Project Authority.

Hearings continue tomorrow.

NOMINATIONS AND SUNDRY BILLS

Committee on Finance: Committee, in executive session, ordered favorably reported the nominations of Catherine B. Cleary, of Wisconsin, to be Assistant Treasurer of the U. S., Albert Cole, of Massachusetts, to be Comptroller of Customs, with headquarters at Boston, and Carroll L. Meins, of Massachusetts, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 4, with headquarters at Boston; and H. R. 1334, a private bill, S. 1151, authorizing transfer to State of Tennessee of certain lands in the VA Center, Mountain Home, Tenn., and H. R. 1563, to amend Veterans Regulation No. 2 (a), as amended, to provide that the amount of certain unnegotiated checks shall be paid as accrued benefits upon the death of the beneficiary-payee.

Committee indefinitely postponed further action on the following private bills: H. R. 1780, 3276, S. 396, 751, and 874.

Also, committee discussed the President's message recommending that a Commission be established to make a review and reexamination of our foreign economic policy, and, without objection, the chairman was instructed to draft a bill for discussion by the committee at a later date.

MUTUAL SECURITY

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee, in executive session, continued its hearings on the proposed extension of the mutual security program, with testimony from Secretary of Defense Charles E. Wilson, and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Gen. Omar Bradley.

Secretary Wilson, who was accompanied by Assistant Defense Secretary Frank C. Nash, stated that the proposed \$5.8 billion program appears reasonably sound, but should not be cut more than the \$1.8 billion reduction from the original budget proposal.

General Bradley stated that the Joint Chiefs of Staff have given increasing emphasis to air power, particularly strategic air power, and expressed the opinion that there

Ec c

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued May 13, 1953
For actions of May 11-12, 1953
83rd-1st, Nos. 85
and 86

CONTENTS

Appropriations.....10,51,54	Export control.....53	Packaging.....25
Bankruptcy, farm.....13	Export insurance.....2	Personnel.....28
Budgeting.....19,46	Extension Service.....11	Poultry.....38
Cheese.....3	Farm situation.....41	Prices, farm.....18
Chemicals.....27	Flag.....15	support.....37
Conservation.....32	Flood control....6,14,24,30	Reclamation.....50
Cotton.....2	Foreign affairs.....7	Research.....1
Credit, controls.....20	Foreign aid.....21	St. Lawrence seaway...19,42
farm.....5	Health.....23	School-lunch program....39
support.....29	Interest rates.....18	Small business.....35
Dairy industry.....55	Irrigation.....43	Soil conservation.....22
Defense production.....9	Labor, farm.....12	Statehood.....16
Economic controls.....17	Lands, public.....8,33	Taxation.....32,36
Education.....34,49	Maple sirup.....40	Trade, foreign....2,4,31,44
Electrification.....47,50	Minerals.....26	Water conservation.....22
Expenditures.....45,52	Nomination.....24	Water utilization.....48

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate committees reported: 1st independent offices appropriation, farm bankruptcy, Extension Service consolidation, and Mexican farm-labor bills. Sens. Kerr, Morse and others criticized USDA for increased interest rates on price-support loans, falling farm prices, etc. Senate debated temporary economic-controls bill. Senate committee adopted motion to include Alaska in Hawaii statehood bill. House took final congressional action on export-insurance bill.

HOUSE - May 11

1. RESEARCH. The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee reported with amendment H.R. 4689, to Amend the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 (H. Rept. 374) (p. 4906).
2. EXPORT INSURANCE. Concurred in Senate amendment on H.R. 4464, to amend the Export-Import Bank Act to insure exported cotton and other products against war risk. This bill will now be sent to the President. (p. 4906).
3. CHEESE. Rep. Harrison spoke on the swiss cheese produced in Wyoming (p. 4907).
4. FOREIGN TRADE. Rep. Eberharter spoke against the Simpson bill, H.R. 4294, to extend the reciprocal trade agreements authority, stating that "it seeks to insure a complete abandonment of our reciprocal trade agreements program as we have known it" (pp. 4909-11).
5. FARM CREDIT. Rep. Patman urged the support of Government bonds at par, and inserted a Senate Resolution on this subject discussing the danger of increased interest rates to the farm program (p. 4908-09).
6. FLOOD CONTROL. Received a Kansas Food Dealers Association petition urging the building of ample flood protection (p. 4914).

HOUSE - May 12

7. FOREIGN AFFAIRS. Received the Foreign Affairs Committee report of the Special Study Mission to Pakistan, India, Thailand and Indochina (H. Rept. 412) (p. 4988).
8. SUBMERGED LANDS. The Judiciary Committee reported without amendment H.R. 5134, to amend the Submerged Lands Act (H. Rept. 413). The House Rules Committee reported a rule for 2 hours of debate on this bill, and one providing for House agreement to Senate amendments to H.R. 4198, the submerged lands bill (p. 4988).
9. DEFENSE PRODUCTION. The Banking and Currency Committee announced tentatively that hearings would begin on Wed., May 20, on the extension of the Defense Production Act (p. D397).

SENATE - May 12

10. APPROPRIATIONS. The Appropriations Committee reported with amendments H.R. 4663, 1st independent offices appropriations bill, 1954 (S. Rept. 237) (p. 4918). Sen. Taft said, "I think I can assure the Senator Saltonstall that the appropriation bill can be handled on Thursday" (p. 4919).
The Rules and Administration Committee reported with amendment S. Con. Res. 8, providing for a consolidated general appropriation bill (S. Rept. 267). Sen. Hayden was granted permission to file individual views on this measure (p. 4919).
11. EXTENSION SERVICE. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported without amendment S. 1679, to consolidate Extension Service authorizations (S. Rept. 266) (p. 4919).
12. FARM LABOR. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported with amendments H.R. 3480, to extend for 3 years the availability of Mexican farm labor (S. Rept. 264) (p. 4919).
13. FARM BANKRUPTCY. The Judiciary Committee reported with amendments S. 25, to amend the Bankruptcy Act so as to provide for farmer-debtor relief (S. Rept. 265) (p. 4919).
14. FLOOD CONTROL. The Public Works Committee reported with amendments S. 261, granting consent and approval of Congress to the Connecticut River Flood Control Compact (S. Rept. 236) (p. 4918).
15. FLAG. The Judiciary Committee reported with amendments S. 694, to prohibit the display of flags of international organizations or other nations in equal or superior prominence or honor to the U. S. flag, except under specified circumstances (S. Rept. 258) (p. 4918).
16. STATEHOOD. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee adopted by an 8 to 7 vote, an Anderson amendment to H. R. 3575, incorporating S. 50, granting statehood to Alaska, into the Hawaii statehood bill (p. D394-5).
17. ECONOMIC CONTROLS. Began debate on S. 1081, providing for temporary economic controls (pp. 4922-56).
18. INTEREST RATES; FARM PRICES. Sens. Kerr, Morse and others criticized USDA for increasing interest rates on price-support loans, and falling farm prices, and the Export-Import Bank for increasing interest rates on export commodity loans (pp. 4956-64).

EXTENSION OF MEXICAN FARM LABOR PROGRAM

MAY 12, 1953.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry,
submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H. R. 3480]

The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 3480) to amend section 509 of title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, to extend for 3 years the period during which agricultural workers may be made available for employment under such title, having considered same, report thereon with a recommendation that it do pass with amendments.

H. R. 3480, as passed by the House, provides for the extension of the program to import agricultural workers from the Republic of Mexico for a period of 3 years. Authority for the program expires December 31 of this year under the provisions of Public Law 78, 82d Congress.

Your committee conducted hearings on S. 1207, a companion bill, and received testimony from officials of the Department of Labor and the Department of Agriculture and from representatives of farm organizations, farm labor users groups, and union labor organizations. These witnesses cited the present need for additional agricultural workers to supplement the supply of domestic labor and stated that the farm labor shortage would continue in 1954. Some indicated that the need for importation of foreign farm labor would continue beyond 1954. Statistics show that whereas employment on farms in the years 1946-49 averaged 11 million, such employment by 1952 has decreased to an average of 9.8 million. Your committee is of the opinion it will be necessary to utilize foreign agricultural laborers to produce adequate supplies of food and fiber through 1954 and possibly longer, and therefore recommends extension of Public Law 78 which has provided an orderly program whereby agricultural workers can be imported from the Republic of Mexico.

However, your committee believes the bill as passed by the House should be amended to provide for a 1-year extension only. The committee has received numerous complaints of discrimination, excessive costs and maladministration of the present program. In recommending extension of the program for 1 year, the Department of Labor reported it would conduct a thorough review of the program, and your committee agrees that such a study would be of value. Extension of the program to December 31, 1954, should give the Department ample time for this review.

During 1952, the first full year's operation of the program as authorized by Public Law 78, 197,100 Mexican workers were contracted for work within the United States. These workers were imported despite efforts of the Department of Labor to secure domestic workers for such jobs. Programs to place domestic workers in agricultural employment included day hauls, farm clinics to bring together farm employers and workers, and programs to bring together farm operators and prospective farm tenants. Special efforts were made to place American Indians, to contract Puerto Ricans, and to use volunteer farm placement representatives in areas which could not support regular employment offices. The Department of Labor also established special information and seasonal employment offices and used many methods of communication to distribute labor-market information to both employers and employees. These programs are in accordance with the provisions of Public Law 78 in that the Secretary of Labor must certify sufficient domestic workers are not available before Mexican workers can be contracted.

As indicated by testimony received by the committee, the cost of the Mexican farm labor program to the United States Government and to private employers has been more than was estimated when Public Law 78 was under consideration. The Department of Labor reported that the present cost to the employer for bringing an agricultural worker from the interior of Mexico to the United States border is now \$11.25 a man, and it was estimated the administrative cost to the Federal Government during the fiscal year 1953 would be \$2,650,000. Construction of 5 migration centers in the Republic of Mexico and 5 reception centers on the Mexico-United States border have cost more than a million dollars. While such construction costs will not be incurred again, your committee does believe that the operating costs of this program can and should be reduced, and urges development of methods whereby the cost to the Federal Government and to the employers will be less than it has been in the past.

The Mexican farm labor program, as authorized by Public Law 78, was designed to establish a legal method by which needed agricultural workers could be obtained. The record shows that the number of aliens entering the country illegally from Mexico has continued to increase. However, the requirement that a United States employer who knowingly employs an alien illegally in this country cannot employ an agricultural worker under the Mexican farm labor program, has reduced employment of so-called wetbacks by farm operators in this country. Without the benefit of a legal method to employ farm-workers from Mexico, your committee believes that employers in need of such labor would again resort to hiring wetbacks.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with subsection (4) of rule XXIX of the Standing Rules of the Senate, changes in existing law made by the bill, as reported, are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in italics, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

[PUBLIC LAW 78—82D CONGRESS]

[CHAPTER 223—1ST SESSION]

[S. 984]

AN ACT To amend the Agricultural Act of 1949

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Agricultural Act of 1949 is amended by adding at the end thereof a new title to read as follows:

“TITLE V—AGRICULTURAL WORKERS

“SEC. 501. For the purpose of assisting in such production of agricultural commodities and products as the Secretary of Agriculture deems necessary, by supplying agricultural workers from the Republic of Mexico (pursuant to arrangements between the United States and the Republic of Mexico), the Secretary of Labor is authorized—

“(1) to recruit such workers (including any such workers who have resided in the United States for the preceding five years, or who are temporarily in the United States under legal entry);

“(2) to establish and operate reception centers at or near the places of actual entry of such workers into the continental United States for the purpose of receiving and housing such workers while arrangements are being made for their employment in, or departure from, the continental United States;

“(3) to provide transportation for such workers from recruitment centers outside the continental United States to such reception centers and transportation from such reception centers to such recruitment centers after termination of employment;

“(4) to provide such workers with such subsistence, emergency medical care, and burial expenses (not exceeding \$150 burial expenses in any one case) as may be or become necessary during transportation authorized by paragraph (3) and while such workers are at reception centers;

“(5) to assist such workers and employers in negotiating contracts for agricultural employment (such workers being free to accept or decline agricultural employment with any eligible employer and to choose the type of agricultural employment they desire, and eligible employers being free to offer agricultural employment to any workers of their choice not under contract to other employers);

“(6) to guarantee the performance by employers of provisions of such contracts relating to the payment of wages or the furnishing of transportation.

“SEC. 502. No workers shall be made available under this title to any employer unless such employer enters into an agreement with the United States—

“(1) to indemnify the United States against loss by reason of its guaranty of such employer's contracts;

“(2) to reimburse the United States for essential expenses, not including salaries or expenses of regular department or agency personnel, incurred by it for the transportation and subsistence of workers under this title in amounts not to exceed \$15 per worker; and

“(3) to pay to the United States, in any case in which a worker is not returned to the reception center in accordance with the contract entered into under section 501 (5), an amount determined by the Secretary of Labor to be equivalent to the normal cost to the employer of returning other workers from the place of employment to such reception center, less any portion thereof required to be paid by other employers.

“SEC. 503. No workers recruited under this title shall be available for employment in any area unless the Secretary of Labor has determined and certified that (1) sufficient domestic workers who are able, willing, and qualified are not avail-

able at the time and place needed to perform the work for which such workers are to be employed, (2) the employment of such workers will not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of domestic agricultural workers similarly employed, and (3) reasonable efforts have been made to attract domestic workers for such employment at wages and standard hours of work comparable to those offered to foreign workers.

"SEC. 504. Workers recruited under this title who are not citizens of the United States shall be admitted to the United States subject to the immigration laws (or if already in, for not less than the preceding five years or by virtue of legal entry, and otherwise eligible for admission to, the United States may, pursuant to arrangements between the United States and the Republic of Mexico, be permitted to remain therein) for such time and under such conditions as may be specified by the Attorney General but, notwithstanding any other provision of law or regulation, no penalty bond shall be required which imposes liability upon any person for the failure of any such worker to depart from the United States upon termination of employment: *Provided*, That no workers shall be made available under this title to, nor shall any workers made available under this title be permitted to remain in the employ of, any employer who has in his employ any Mexican alien when such employer knows or has reasonable grounds to believe or suspect or by reasonable inquiry could have ascertained that such Mexican alien is not lawfully within the United States.

"SEC. 505. (a) Section 210 (a) (1) of the Social Security Act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subparagraph as follows:

"(C) Service performed by foreign agricultural workers under contracts entered into in accordance with title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended."

"(b) Section 1426 (b) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subparagraph as follows:

"(C) Service performed by foreign agricultural workers under contracts entered into in accordance with title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended."

"(c) Workers recruited under the provisions of this title shall not be subject to the head tax levied under section 2 of the Immigration Act of 1917 (8 U. S. C., sec. 132).

"SEC. 506. For the purposes of this title, the Secretary of Labor is authorized—

"(1) to enter into agreements with Federal and State agencies; to utilize (pursuant to such agreements) the facilities and services of such agencies; and to allocate or transfer funds or otherwise to pay or reimburse such agencies for expenses in connection therewith;

"(2) to accept and utilize voluntary and uncompensated services; and

"(3) when necessary to supplement the domestic agricultural labor force, to cooperate with the Secretary of State in negotiating and carrying out agreements or arrangements relating to the employment in the United States, subject to the immigration laws, of agricultural workers from the Republic of Mexico.

"SEC. 507. For the purposes of this title—

"(1) The term 'agricultural employment' includes services or activities included within the provisions of section 3 (f) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, or section 1426 (h) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, horticultural employment, cotton ginning, compressing and storing, crushing of oil seeds, and the packing, canning, freezing, drying, or other processing of perishable or seasonable agricultural products.

"(2) The term 'employer' shall include an association, or other group, of employers, but only if (A) those of its members for whom workers are being obtained are bound, in the event of its default, to carry out the obligations undertaken by it pursuant to section 502, or (B) the Secretary determines that such individual liability is not necessary to assure performance of such obligations.

"SEC. 508. Nothing in this Act shall be construed as limiting the authority of the Attorney General, pursuant to the general immigration laws, to permit the importation of aliens of any nationality for agricultural employment as defined in section 507, or to permit any such alien who entered the United States legally to remain for the purpose of engaging in such agricultural employment under such conditions and for such time as he, the Attorney General, shall specify.

"SEC. 509. No workers will be made available under this title for employment after [December 31, 1953] *December 31, 1954.*"

Calendar No. 264

83^d CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 3480

[Report No. 264]

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

APRIL 16 (legislative day, APRIL 6), 1953

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

MAY 12, 1953

Reported by Mr. ELLENDER, with amendments

[Omit the part struck through and insert the part printed in italic]

AN ACT

To amend section 509 of title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, to extend for three years the period during which agricultural workers may be made available for employment under such title.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That section 509 of title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949,
4 as amended, is amended by striking out "December 31,
5 1953" and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, ~~1956~~
6 1954".

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to amend section 509 of title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, to extend for one year the period during which agricultural workers may be made available for employment under such title."

Passed the House of Representatives April 15, 1953.

Attest:

LYLE O. SNADER,

Clerk.

83^d CONGRESS
1st Session

H. R. 3480

[Report No. 264]

AN ACT

To amend section 509 of title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, to extend for three years the period during which agricultural workers may be made available for employment under such title.

APRIL 16 (legislative day, APRIL 6), 1953
Read twice and referred to the Committee on
Agriculture and Forestry

MAY 12, 1953

Reported with amendments

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued June 9, 1953
For actions of June 8, 1953
83rd-1st, No. 104

CONTENTS

Appropriations.....1,2,17,24,34	Labor, farm.....10	Reclamation.....26,32
Beef purchases.....13	Land laws.....9	Roads.....11
Buy American.....13	Lands, grazing.....25	Rural telephone loans.....17
C.C.C.....21	Livestock.....12	Tariffs.....13
Cooperatives.....31	Loans, forest.....29	Taxation.....30,31
Economic controls.....16	rural telephone.....17	Trade, foreign.....5
Farm bankruptcy.....4	Prices, cattle.....20	Transportation.....7,19
Farm program.....23	farm.....20	Veterans' preference.....28
F.H.A.....22	support.....12,20	Water rights.....9
Flood control.....6,22	Property.....33	Weather control.....3
Grain.....12,21,27	Purchasing.....8	Wheat.....18
Hawaii statehood.....14		

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate committee reported USDA appropriation bill. Senate passed farm-bankruptcy and weather-control bills. House committees reported economic controls and wheat marketing quota bills. House received conference report on 3rd supplemental appropriation bill.

SENATE

1. **AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1954.** The Appropriations Committee reported with amendments this bill, H.R. 5227 (S. Rept. 382) (p. 6370).

Representatives of the Department agencies and bureaus have been advised in detail of the Committee's actions. Copies of the bill as reported, committee report, and hearings will be distributed directly to the agency budget offices, as soon as received, pursuant to a distribution list that has been worked out with the Department agencies. The agencies will receive the material at the same time this office will receive it. The material will not be distributed from this office. In general, copies should be obtained through the agency and bureau budget offices rather than from this office.

At the end of this Digest are (1) a summary comparison of the Committee actions with the 1954 estimates, House figures, and total anticipated funds available in 1953, and (2) excerpts from the committee report.

2. **TREASURY-POST OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1954.** The Appropriations Committee reported without amendment this bill, H.R. 5174 (S. Rept. 373) (p. 6369).

3. **WEATHER CONTROL.** Passed as reported S. 285 (pp. 6390-2). This bill provides for a temporary Advisory Committee on Weather Control comprised of 9 members, including 5 appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the

Senate from persons in private life with outstanding ability in the fields of science, agriculture, and business, and the Secretaries of Defense, Interior, Agriculture, and Commerce, or their designees. The Committee shall make a complete study and evaluation of public and private experiments in weather control for the purpose of determining the extent to which the U. S. should experiment with, engage in, or regulate activities designed to control weather. The Committee shall have authority to secure information and statistics from Federal agencies, to hold hearings and take testimony, and to require keeping and production of records by persons undertaking weather control experiments. It shall report to Congress at the earliest possible moment on the advisability of Government regulation of activities of persons attempting to modify the weather and shall make its final report to Congress not later than June 30, 1956, 30 days after which it shall expire.

4. FARM BANKRUPTCY. Passed as reported S. 25, to amend the uniform bankruptcy law so as to provide for farmer-debtor relief thereunder (pp. 6381-7, 6402).
5. FOREIGN TRADE. Passed as reported by the Rules Committee S. Res. 25, to provide for an investigation of means of expanding foreign investments and trade (pp. 6392-3).
6. FLOOD CONTROL. Passed without amendment H.R. 4025, to authorize additional appropriations for flood control projects in the Columbia River Basin (p. 6390). This bill will now be sent to the President.
Passed with amendment S. 621, to authorize additional appropriations for the Lower San Joaquin River project (pp. 6389, 6402).
7. TRANSPORTATION. Passed with amendment H.R. 2347, to continue for 6 months after termination of the national emergency certain powers relating to priorities in transportation (p. 6392).
8. PURCHASING. Passed as reported S. 24, to permit review of decisions of Government contracting officers involving questions of fact arising under Government contracts in cases other than those in which fraud is alleged (pp. 6375-76, 6402, 6406).
9. LAND LAWS. Agreed to Committee amendments and several McCarran amendments before passing over S. 1857, providing that no condemnation of lands by the Federal Government shall destroy, diminish, or otherwise impair water rights on lands not condemned (pp. 6387-8).
10. FARM LABOR. Discussed and passed over H.R. 3480, to extend for 3 years the period of availability of Mexican farm labor in this country (p. 6381). Sen. Knowland inserted correspondence with the Labor Department and certain agricultural and other groups in Calif. relative to negotiations between this Government and Mexico on this matter (pp. 6403-6).
11. ROADS. Received a Mich. Legislature memorial urging the Federal Government "to give every possible consideration to the general purposes of the Hearst plan for better roads" (p. 6368).
12. PRICE SUPPORTS. Received a Calif. Legislature resolution urging Congress to support corn and feed grain on a flexible basis and to authorize liquidation of surplus Government stocks thereof "at prices which the livestock industry and other potential purchasers are able to pay" (p. 6368).

security clearance under section 1 of this act.

SEC. 3. (a) Whoever, being a citizen of the United States, shall accept any office or employment in or under the United Nations or any organ or agency thereof in violation of subsection 1 (a) of this act shall be fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned for not more than 5 years, or both.

(b) Whoever, being a citizen of the United States and an officer or employee of the United Nations or any organ or agency thereof, shall wilfully fail to comply with the requirements of section 2 of this act, or who shall aid, abet, or counsel any other such person to refrain from compliance with such requirements, shall be fined not more than \$10,000, or imprisoned for not more than 5 years, or both.

(c) Whoever shall wilfully make any false statement in any application or registration statement filed under this act, or wilfully omit to state in any such application or registration statement any fact required by law or regulation to be stated therein or necessary to make the statements made or information given therein not misleading, shall be fined not more than \$10,000, or imprisoned for not more than 5 years, or both.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be inserted in the RECORD following the passage of Senate bill 3 a statement which I have prepared in connection with the bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. McCARRAN. This bill is designed to implement the recommendations of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, and to guarantee by statute that American citizens who are not loyal to this country shall not be able to secure employment with the United Nations and other international organizations.

The bill is directly in line with the avowed purposes of the present administration, and its provisions would dovetail very well indeed with the Executive orders of the President in this regard.

The bill does not impose any restrictions upon the United Nations itself, nor does it attempt to coerce the officials of that international organization. The bill recognizes that the Congress cannot require the administrative officials of the United Nations to dismiss American nationals merely because this Government might disapprove of the employment of such persons.

This bill operates directly upon American nationals, and has no operating effect directly upon the United Nations. With respect to an American national now employed by the United Nations, this bill merely requires the submission of certain information basic to a proper determination of the question as to whether such employee represents a security risk to the United States. With respect to persons not now employed by the United Nations, this bill would explicitly prohibit acceptance of such employment without first receiving security clearance.

Under this bill, the test would be whether the Attorney General finds evidence that there is a reasonable possibility of danger to the security of the United States through the employment of the applicant by the international organization. If the Attorney General finds such danger to the security of the United States, he would issue a written denial of the application for security clearance, together with a statement of his reason

for such denial, and would forward that information to the United Nations or a special agency thereof, so that body would have notice of the doubtful loyalty to the United States of the prospective employee. Such a denial would not, of course, bar the United Nations from hiring the applicant; but it would make it unlawful for the applicant himself thereafter to accept a United Nations job. On the other hand, if the Attorney General should find that the applicant's employment by the United Nations would not involve reasonable possibility of danger to the security of the United States, he would give a security clearance.

As I have declared before, it is perfectly clear that there is no way, except by congressional action, to prohibit United States nationals who are subversives from accepting employment with the United Nations. There is no way, except by congressional action, to require present employees of the United Nations, who are United States nationals, to file registration statements designed to disclose possible subversion in that group, and to make such statements available to the Government of the United States. If Congress deems it desirable to do these things, Congress will have to do them by legislation. These are the things the bill S. 3, is designed to do. The issue is perfectly clear cut.

I anticipate that there will be objection to this bill, on any call of the calendar, in view of the fact that both the State Department and the Department of Justice have filed letters against the bill. I discussed those letters of the Departments in question on the occasion of an earlier calendar call. I do not propose to do so again except to say that the objections are not well founded, and in my opinion, are not sincere. However, because these objections have been made, I anticipate it will not be possible to secure consideration of this bill on a call of the calendar. I therefore ask the able majority leader whether, in order that Senators who do want to assure by law that American nationals of doubtful loyalty to the United States may not accept employment with the United Nations may have an opportunity to vote for this bill, he will be willing to assent to have this bill called up on motion.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1349) to amend title 28, United States Code, was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1663) to increase the salaries of Members of Congress, judges of the United States courts, and United States attorneys, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, this bill is certainly not proposed legislation to be disposed of on the unanimous-consent calendar, and I therefore ask that it be passed over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

IMPORTATION OF AGRICULTURAL LABOR—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 3480) to amend section 509 of title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, to extend for 3 years the period during which agricultural workers may be made available for employment under such title, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Over.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I did not know that the Senator from New Jersey was going to object to action on the bill at this time. I simply wish to say that, so far, the United States Department of Labor seems to be unable to reach any agreement with the Mexican Government regarding the importation of Mexican field labor into the United States. Under the circumstance, it would appear to be a futile gesture to enact legislation providing for that which it seems impossible to accomplish at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

DISTRIBUTION OF TRUST FUNDS HELD BY SHOSHONE AND ARAP-AHO TRIBES OF THE WIND RIVER RESERVATION

The bill (H. R. 444) to amend the act of May 19, 1947, so as to increase the percentage of certain trust funds held by the Shoshone and Arapaho Tribes of the Wind River Reservation which is to be distributed per capita to individual members of such tribes was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. LANGER subsequently said: Mr. President, my attention was momentarily distracted when the Senate passed Order No. 265 (H. R. 444). I ask unanimous consent that the action of the Senate in passing the bill be reconsidered and the bill be passed over temporarily.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAPEHART in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The resolution (S. Res. 20) amending the cloture rule with respect to the number required for adoption of a cloture motion was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be passed over.

FARMER-DEBTOR RELIEF UNDER BANKRUPTCY ACT

The bill (S. 25) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, in this case also I favor the proposed legislation, but I do not feel that the bill is one which should be considered during a call of the calendar.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I have no desire to interfere with the able presentation which I know will be made by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], who is in charge of this bill. I rise merely to say that it is a good bill, carefully worked out over a period of years; and that, in my opinion, now is

the time to pass such legislation, as this. It is not a satisfactory method of approach to grant relief to the farmer only when he is in desperate straits, and under the prod of the direst necessity, when hasty and ill-considered action is most likely. It is far better to provide in advance for the contingencies which we all realize may come to pass, much as we hope against such an eventuality, by passing a bill of this nature in an atmosphere of calm deliberation. This bill would be good for the farmers and it would be good for the country, and I hope the Senate will consider it favorably when it is brought up.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I have just been reminded that this is practically the same bill that was passed last year after thorough explanation and debate on the floor, and that it contains virtually the same language. Is my understanding correct?

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I withhold any objection I may have had.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendments.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 15, line 2, after the word "control", it is proposed to strike out "such as a national emergency, as the result of which farmers in general cannot operate with normal profits, or local emergencies, such as drought, freeze, flood and hail,"; in line 8, after the word "expenditures", to insert "and"; in the same line, after the word "operations", to strike out the comma and "and lack of farming ability" and insert a period, and in line 9, after the amendment last above stated, to insert "Causes beyond the debtor's control shall include, but not be limited to, national emergencies, or declines in the agricultural market, or acreage reductions under the law, as a result of any of which the farmer-debtor cannot operate at a profit, or local emergencies, or drought, freeze, fire, flood, hail, or insect damage, any of which would make farming operations at a profit impracticable.", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 75 of the act entitled, "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, as amended, is hereby amended and incorporated as chapter XVI of such act, to read as follows:

"CHAPTER XVI—FARMER-DEBTOR RELIEF

"ARTICLE I—CONSTRUCTION

"SEC. 901. The provisions of this chapter shall apply exclusively to proceedings under this chapter.

"SEC. 902. The provisions of chapters I to VII, inclusive, of this act shall, insofar as they are not inconsistent or in conflict with the provisions of this chapter, apply in proceedings under this chapter. For the purposes of such application, provisions relating to 'bankrupts' shall be deemed to relate also to 'debtors,' and 'bankruptcy proceedings' or 'proceedings in bankruptcy' shall be deemed to include proceedings under this chapter. For the purposes of such application, the date of the filing of the petition in bankruptcy shall be taken to be the date of the filing of an original petition under section 922 of this act, and the date of adjudication shall be taken to be the date of

approval of a petition filed under section 921 or 922 of this act, except where an adjudication had previously been entered.

"ARTICLE II—DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 906. For the purposes of this chapter, unless inconsistent with the context—

"(1) 'claims' shall include all claims of whatever character against the debtor or his property, whether or not such claims are provable as debts under section 63 of this act, and whether secured or unsecured, liquidated or unliquidated, fixed or contingent;

"(2) 'unsecured creditor' shall mean the holder of any unsecured claim;

"(3) 'secured creditor' shall include the holder of any secured claim, and any purchaser at a judicial or official sale to whom the deed was not delivered at the time the petition was filed to the extent of the money paid or credit received by such purchaser;

"(4) 'debtor' shall mean a farmer who files a petition under this chapter;

"(5) 'debts' shall include all claims;

"(6) 'executory contracts' shall include unexpired leases of real property;

"(7) 'farmer' shall mean an individual, or a partnership, or a corporation where actual farmers own at least 75 percent of its capital stock, and which farmer is primarily bona fide engaged in producing products of the soil, or in dairy farming, or in the production of poultry or livestock, or in the production of poultry or livestock products in their unmanufactured state, and the principal part of whose gross income is derived from any one or more of such operations, whether so engaged personally or as a tenant or by tenants, and shall include the executor, administrator, or personal representative of the estate of any such deceased person so engaged at the time of his death in one or more of the foregoing operations: *Provided, however,* That the provisions of this chapter shall not be available to a farmer whose sole interest in property, as hereinafter defined, is that of tenant;

"(8) 'individual' shall include common, joint, community, and entirety owners, provided that as to encumbered property all of such owners join in the petition so that the court will acquire jurisdiction over all interests in any affected encumbered property;

"(9) 'petition' shall mean a petition filed in a court of bankruptcy or with its clerk, by a debtor praying for the benefits of this chapter;

"(10) 'period of redemption' shall include any State moratorium, whether established by legislative enactment or executive proclamation, or where the period of redemption has been extended by judicial decree or as provided elsewhere in this chapter;

"(11) 'property' of a debtor shall include all his property, real or personal, wherever located, of every kind and nature, including but not limited to his interests in contracts for purchase, contracts for deed, conditional sales contracts, rights or equities of redemption, rights under trust deeds given as security, rights within a period of redemption which has not expired, rights under trust deeds which have not become absolute, rights existing in case of sale which has not been confirmed or where a deed pursuant to sale has not been delivered; and

"(12) 'integral part or parcel' of a debtor's property shall not include only a portion of any contract lienholder's security.

"ARTICLE III—JURISDICTION, POWERS, AND DUTIES OF THE COURT

"SEC. 911. Where not inconsistent with the provisions of this chapter, the court in which the petition is filed shall, for the purposes of this chapter, have exclusive jurisdiction of the debtor and his property, wherever located.

"SEC. 912. Prior to the approval of a petition, the jurisdiction, powers, and duties of the court and of its officers, where not in-

consistent with the provisions of this chapter, shall be the same as in a bankruptcy proceeding before adjudication.

"SEC. 913. Upon the approval of a petition, the jurisdiction, powers, and duties of the court and of its officers where not inconsistent with the provisions of this chapter shall be the same as in a bankruptcy proceeding upon adjudication.

"SEC. 914. Upon the approval of a petition under this chapter, the court may, in addition to the jurisdiction, powers, and duties hereinabove and elsewhere in this chapter conferred and imposed upon it, permit the rejection of executory contracts of the debtor, upon notice to the parties to such contracts and to such other parties in interest as the court may designate.

"SEC. 915. Whenever notice is to be given under this chapter, if not otherwise specified hereunder, the court shall designate the time within which, the persons to whom, the form and manner in which the notice shall be given, and the contents of the notice. Any notice to be given under this chapter may be combined, whenever feasible, with any other notice or notices to be given under this chapter.

"SEC. 916. The judge may transfer a proceeding under this chapter to a court of bankruptcy in any other district, regardless of the residence of the debtor, if the interests of the parties will be best served by such transfer.

"SEC. 917. Where a petition is filed by the executor, administrator, or personal representative of the estate of a deceased debtor, the consent of the court in which such estate is pending shall not be required.

"SEC. 918. Where not inconsistent with the provisions of this chapter, the jurisdiction of appellate courts shall be the same as in a bankruptcy proceeding.

"ARTICLE IV—PETITION, APPROVAL, AND STAY

"SEC. 921. A debtor may file a petition under this chapter in a pending bankruptcy proceeding either before or after his adjudication.

"SEC. 922. If no bankruptcy proceeding is pending, a debtor may file an original petition under this chapter with the court in whose territorial jurisdiction he has resided or the principal part of his farming operations have occurred for the preceding 6 months or for a longer portion of the preceding 6 months than in any other jurisdiction. The filing of such petition shall be accompanied by payment to the clerk of a filing fee of \$45, to be distributed by him as in the case of a bankruptcy proceeding.

"SEC. 923. A petition filed under this chapter shall state—

"(1) that the debtor is insolvent or unable to pay his debts as they mature and that he desires to avail himself of the benefits of this chapter; and

"(2) the nature and status of all pending proceedings affecting the property of the debtor known to him and the courts in which they are pending.

"SEC. 924. The petition shall be filed in triplicate and at the time it is filed, or within 10 days thereafter, the debtor shall file in triplicate—

"(1) a statement of the executory contracts of the debtor;

"(2) the schedules and statement of affairs, if not previously filed, including a statement of rights of redemption which have not expired and rights under trust deeds which have not become absolute, and of deeds which have not been confirmed or delivered, and the property affected thereby;

"(3) where a petition is filed by the legal representative of the estate of a deceased debtor, copies of his appointment by the probate court, of which the original shall be certified;

"(4) his claim of exemption;

No. 32, with headquarters at Honolulu, Hawaii;

John A. Stanek, of Illinois, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 39, with headquarters at Chicago, Ill.; and

John J. Devaney, of New York, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 8, with headquarters at Rochester, N. Y.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, for the benefit of the distinguished minority leader I will say that it is desired that only the nominations under new reports be considered at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar under the heading "New Reports" will be stated.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Dallas S. Townsend to be an assistant attorney general.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I rise with great pride in my own State and its people as we proceed to the consideration of the nomination of Dallas Townsend, of the town of Montclair, N. J., to be Assistant Attorney General of the United States, for Alien Property.

My pride stems in this instance from the fact that New Jersey continues to produce for the general welfare of our Nation, men of great character and integrity to assume important roles in the Federal Government as we undertake to set our course under a new administration.

Not only do the men who have come from New Jersey for service here in the Nation's Capital have character and integrity—they also have great capacity and broad experience in their chosen field of endeavor.

It is unnecessary to recount their names for those names are fresh in the memories of the 83d Congress, but, Mr. President, I hasten to say that the name of Dallas Townsend adds luster to the list.

Though a Jerseyman, he has long practiced law in the great State of New York with distinction and honor.

In his own community—one of the finest municipalities in the State of New Jersey—he has many times earned the gratitude of his fellow citizens.

It was there—in Montclair, N. J.—where he gave his first account of himself as a public servant when he served as one of the city fathers, as town commissioner, and director of public safety from 1936 until 1942.

Dallas Townsend abruptly ended this service, Mr. President, to answer a higher call.

He joined the Army as a colonel, and served with distinction as a civil affairs officer both in this country and overseas.

In 1945 and 1946 he was deputy commissioner of the American military mission in Hungary.

For his efforts on behalf of his country, Dallas Townsend was awarded the Legion of Merit.

He also served, Mr. President, as an officer in the field artillery during World War I.

Colonel Townsend is a product of Columbia University, having received his undergraduate, law, and master's degrees at that institution.

He was honored there in 1950 by the alumni of his alma mater with the award of the Columbia Lion for outstanding and distinguished service.

That award was presented to him by Dwight D. Eisenhower, then president of Columbia.

Mr. President, I could go on and on paying tribute to Colonel Townsend for the splendid record he has established as a citizen and as a soldier. But, as brevity is the soul of wit, so it is to my mind the keynote of eloquence, and since I would like my eulogy of this splendid New Jerseyman to speak with a degree of eloquence, I shall immediately conclude by saying that there never was a nomination of the Chief Executive transmitted to the Senate of the United States for our advice and consent where the nominee possessed greater or more appropriate talents for the post to be filled than does Col. Dallas Townsend.

Outstanding in his profession, he is now called to a post which requires tremendous legal ability and experience.

Mr. President, I state with complete certainty that his record of performance will make us all happy and proud that we were privileged to vote for his confirmation.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I was happy to hear the very fine tribute paid to Mr. Townsend by my colleague. I rise to identify myself with his fine presentation.

I know Mr. Townsend personally, and I have great pride in the fact that I had a part in initiating the nomination which finally brought about his appointment. We were looking for someone to fill this very important office, and Mr. Brownell, the Attorney General, asked me if I knew the gentleman in question. It afforded me great pride to tell him that I did, and I gave Mr. Brownell an outline of his background and excellent qualifications. My colleague and I felt that we could not do better for our State and for the Nation than to urge the appointment of Mr. Townsend to this important position. He is one of our most distinguished lawyers and citizens, and the United States Government is to be congratulated upon having a man of his character take this important position.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of United States attorneys.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of United States attorneys are confirmed en bloc.

CLINTON G. RICHARDS

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I do not wish the occasion to pass without my saying a few words with respect to the nomination of Mr. Clinton G. Richards, of Deadwood, S. Dak. His nomination

as a United States attorney has now been confirmed, and he will serve as United States attorney for the district of South Dakota.

I have known Mr. Richards for 40 years, which runs back to the time when both of us were in grade school. He is a man of excellent character, outstanding legal qualifications, and of proven ability in the prosecutor's office.

He did not ask for this position, and he was not an applicant for it in that sense. But the position sought him. I am glad he has seen fit to respond to this call to duty. It means that he will give up his private law practice at a considerable sacrifice. But he is doing it in a spirit of real public service.

I predict for him a career of public service which will reflect great credit on him, on his country, and on this administration.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of all nominations this day confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume consideration of legislative business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRICKER in the chair). Without objection, the Senate will resume consideration of legislative business.

IMPORTATION OF MEXICAN AGRICULTURAL WORKERS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point, correspondence which I have had with the Department of Labor and certain agricultural and other groups in California relative to negotiations going on between our Government and the Republic of Mexico with respect to agricultural labor.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
Washington, May 20, 1953.
The Honorable WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR KNOWLAND: Representatives of certain California farm labor associations have by mail and telegram sent word to a number of individuals and organizations in many States to the effect that the United States Department of Labor has used "extreme pressure" on the Mexican Government to interpret Article 21 of the Migrant Labor Agreement of 1951, as amended, to permit Mexican workers to be represented by American unions. Some of the communications indicate that the Mexican Government was opposed to having its workers represented by American unions but yielded to pressure from representatives of the Department of Labor. These statements are completely inaccurate.

I am writing you in order that the record may be made perfectly clear in respect to article 21 and its interpretation. Article 21 reads as follows:

"REPRESENTATIVES OF MEXICAN WORKERS"

"The Mexican workers shall enjoy the right to elect their own representatives who shall be recognized by the employer as spokesman for the Mexican workers for the purpose of maintaining the work contract between the Mexican workers, and the employer, provided that this article shall not affect the right of the Mexican worker individually to contact his employer, the Mexican Consul, or the representative of the Secretary of Labor with respect to his employment under this work contract."

Last fall a number of California employer associations, as well as officers of labor unions, requested an official interpretation of article 21. All interested parties were advised that any official interpretation of the agreement must, under the terms of the agreement, be a joint interpretation by the two governments. In March of this year conversations were begun with Mexico on questions of interpretation of various articles in the agreement and work contract, including article 21.

I would like to call your attention to the fact that the wording of article 21 quoted above has been in the International Agreement since August 12, 1951, and until this recent campaign was inspired, we have heard of no major dispute arising out of the article. It seems entirely clear that under the wording of article 21 the right of the Mexican workers to elect their own representatives is not limited to members of their own group. In fact, it has been our understanding since this wording has appeared in the agreement that the Mexican workers had considerable freedom in selecting their representatives. Any other construction would under certain circumstances bar the Mexican workers from designating spokesmen who understood the English language, for example, the language of article 21, therefore, necessarily limited to United States representatives who were recently attempting to negotiate interpretations with Mexican officials in that all negotiations with respect to interpretations had to be carried on within the generally understood meaning of the articles actually appearing in the International Agreement.

In these conversations with Mexico, the Mexican Government indicated that it was its opinion this article should be interpreted to mean that any individual Mexican worker could be represented by any labor union. The United States representatives pointed out that the intent of the agreement was that the workers should elect representatives, meaning that the workers collectively would by a majority vote elect their representatives. Individual workers could, however, under the express language of article 21, either personally or through their consuls present their own grievances to employers.

It was also pointed out to Mexico that to permit union representation of individual workers where the union was not the elected representative would create an impossible administrative problem from the standpoint of all concerned, if we were faced with dealing with several unions on the same issues.

The position of the representatives of the Department of Labor in these conversations was not to convince Mexico that there should be representation permitted by labor unions but that such representation should be limited to representation only when the labor union had been elected as the representative by a majority of the Mexican workers. Mexico has always taken the position that workers may join and be represented by unions.

The Department of Labor also took the position that only bona fide labor unions would be eligible as representatives, if elected, in order to assure that employers would not be required to deal with fringe or subversive groups.

I believe the text of the joint interpretation, as ultimately subscribed to, clearly

delimits the area and scope of representation under article 21. This joint interpretation reads as follows:

"JOINT INTERPRETATIONS, MIGRATORY LABOR AGREEMENT OF 1951, AS AMENDED"

"ARTICLE 21—REPRESENTATION OF MEXICAN WORKERS"

"This article is designated to assure that Mexican workers are permitted to elect, by a majority vote, a representative or representatives to present to their employers grievances arising out of the failure of the employer to comply with the Migrant Labor Agreement of 1951, as amended, or the work contract. Representatives so elected are not authorized to bargain for terms and conditions of employment different than those contained in the work contract.

"The elected representatives may be an individual or individuals from the workers' own numbers, or from any bona fide labor organization, and the employer must recognize such representatives as spokesmen for the workers. This interpretation does not in any way deprive the Mexican worker of the right to be represented in any case by a Mexican consul. An individual may himself or through the elected representative present his claim to the employer and the employer is, under article 21, required to deal with either the worker individually or the elected representative on complaints arising out of the work contract. If, however, an individual worker desires to have his complaint presented by a personal representative other than one elected by the majority of the workers pursuant to article 21, the employer is required to recognize such a representative only to the extent that such recognition is required by Federal or State law."

I would like to point out that under this interpretation representation of workers would be confined to the definitions, duties, and responsibilities as set forth in the migratory labor agreement of 1951, as amended, and the standard work contract and does not authorize bargaining for different terms and conditions.

While both governments were in agreement as to this interpretation of article 21, it is not an official interpretation for the reason that Mexico, while agreeing on this and other points as a matter of interpretation, refused to exchange notes which would make the interpretations official because of disagreement of an official interpretation of article 27.

In connection with the interpretation of article 27 the Mexican Government took a firm position that all contracts involving transfer of workers from one employer to another had to be signed by the Mexican consul. The United States delegates steadfastly refused to acquiesce in this kind of interpretation in order to protect the interest of American employers. Aside from the fact that this article could not reasonably be so interpreted it would mean that employers who obtained workers by virtue of a transfer could have their contracts invalidated if the Mexican consul refused to affix his signature to the contract even though prior oral consent had been given.

It is indeed regrettable that the farm groups should be misled by false information disseminated by certain representatives of farm associations, designed for the purpose of bringing pressure for transferring the Farm Placement Service from this Department to the Department of Agriculture. It is extremely unfortunate that these statements were released at this time since it is my opinion that such information immediately becomes available to the Mexican Government and comes at a time when we are attempting to work out several violations of the agreement by Mexico which are to the detriment of the growers.

For your information, the Mexican Government, in complete violation of the agreement, closed the migration center at Monterrey, even though that was one of the centers designated in the agreement. This costs the growers more money since they have to go further into the interior of Mexico to recruit and transport. I am enclosing a copy of a letter from this Department to the Department of State protesting this action.

While our interpreting team was in Mexico, which team included a representative from the Department of State, we were informed by the Mexican Government that unless we increased the wage rates by 10 percent over and above last year's rates, we would have no Mexican nationals on and after May 1, 1953. When we refused to comply with this, they did not carry through the threat but did, on May 12, notify us through the Department of State that unless certain conditions were guaranteed the Mexican nationals and certain wage increases given them, they would no longer furnish Mexican nationals for farm labor. A copy of this note is also enclosed for your information.

There have been numerous other violations of the agreement which we have been attempting to work out with the Mexican Government, which are too many to mention, and we believe you are generally familiar with them through the complaints from the growers in your district which you have from time to time referred to us for adjudication.

We believe that the tactics used in this latest situation, which are immediately known to the Mexican Government, are a very great handicap to us in seeing that they comply with the international agreement.

Yours very truly,

LLOYD A. MASHBURN,
Under Secretary of Labor.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
May 12, 1953.

From: Mexico City.
To: Secretary of State.
No: 1715, May 12.
Priority for Belton.

Following is English translation Foreign Office note 135296, dated May 8, 1953, received today:

"The Ministry for Foreign Relations presents its compliments to the Embassy of the United States of America and has the honor of stating the following:

"1. Articles 9 and 15 of the international agreement of August 11, 1951, as amended on May 19, 1952, regarding the contracting of Mexican agricultural laborers destined for the United States, recognize as basic principles for the employment of said laborers in the United States, on the one hand, that the Mexican workers shall not be employed in that country when their employment affects unfavorably the salaries or living conditions of the domestic agricultural laborers; and, on the other hand, that the Secretary of Labor shall not issue any certification for employment of Mexican laborers on the basis of requests in which a wage rate is specified which is influenced by the presence of illegal laborers, or which is insufficient to cover the laborer's necessities of life.

"2. In view of the fact that the rising cost of living signifies a considerable reduction in the income of the Mexican laborers contracted in accordance with the agreement, the Government of Mexico considers it pertinent that, for the contracting of Mexican laborers which starts this month of May, a general revision be made of the wage rates established in previous years, to such a degree that the laborer receives a salary which corresponds to that received by the American workers.

"3. Furthermore, the discrepancy which exists between the original wage rates as determined by the Southeastern States of the

United States, compared to those applied to the laborers for the same tasks in the Western and Middle Western States, has frequently caused a strong resistance on the part of the braceros to lend their services in those entities first mentioned, the workers preferring to be contracted for the West.

"4. In view of the foregoing, and based on the statistical data and salary graphs of the wages received in the year 1952 by the Mexican contract laborers compared to the averages of the prevailing wages in those regions where American laborers are employed, for the same agricultural tasks, the Government of Mexico has arrived at the following conclusions:

"First. Every request from employers who wish to engage Mexican workers must be refused when they offer salaries lower than the minimum initial rates of \$2.75 for the first hand picking of 100 pounds of cotton, the minimum wage rates being proportionately adjusted for picking under different conditions, as well as for other types of agricultural labors; and

"Second. That, as a general rule, it is proper to establish for all agricultural regions which employ Mexican laborers an increase of the hourly wage, fixing an initial minimum of not less than \$0.65 for the States of the Southeast, of \$0.75 for the Middle West, and of \$0.80 for the Western States.

"MEXICO, D. F., May 8, 1953."

In commenting upon this note this morning, Calderon stated he hoped Department of Labor would act immediately. He would not say when Mexican representatives would be ordered enforce provisions note.

WHITE.

APRIL 23, 1953.

The honorable the SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The Mexican Government has recently taken certain unilateral actions in connection with the operation of the Mexican migratory labor program which are clearly in violation of the Migrant Labor Agreement of 1951, as amended. In order to assure that we are not faced with a situation which may jeopardize our ability to obtain an adequate supply of agricultural workers, a large number of which will be needed within a short period, I believe that a protest should be promptly lodged with the Mexican Government to indicate the seriousness with which we view its actions. The first of these problems deals with the action of the Mexican Government in closing the migratory station at Monterrey.

As you know, during the conference between the United States and Mexico which resulted in the negotiation of the Migrant Labor Agreement of 1951, protracted discussions were held with respect to where the migratory stations in Mexico were to be located. The experience of the United States in operating under a previous agreement, which provided that Mexico had the right to determine freely where the recruitment stations were to be operated, clearly demonstrated the imperativeness of specifying in the agreement the exact locale of the various recruitment stations.

The present locations, agreed upon after considerable debate, represent a compromise between the diverse positions initially taken by both Governments. The United States initially insisted that all recruitment be at stations relatively near the United States-Mexican border, while Mexico's initial position was that all recruitment should be at stations located deep in the interior of Mexico. The five stations ultimately agreed upon and specified in article 4 of the current Migrant Labor Agreement are Monterrey, Nuevo Leon; Chihuahua, Chihuahua; Irapuato, Guanajuato; Guadalajara, Jalisco; and Durango, Durango.

Under the provisions of article 4 there is a clear and specific obligation assumed by the Government of Mexico to establish and maintain a migratory station at Monterrey, Nuevo Leon. Notwithstanding this obligation undertaken by Mexico as a matter of international agreement, the Government of Mexico, in derogation of this contractual obligation and in clear violation of article 4 of the Migrant Labor Agreement of 1951, as amended, by unilateral action in August 1952 closed the migratory station at Monterrey and has to the present date refused to honor its commitment to maintain a migratory station at this point.

We are fully cognizant of the reasons given by the Mexican Government for its refusal to comply with its obligation under article 4. Aside from the questionable validity of some of the reasons advanced by Mexico for its action, I believe it is pertinent to point out that these same arguments were advanced by Mexico during the 1951 negotiations prior to the time that Mexico consented to establish the migratory station at Monterrey. The principal arguments presented by Mexico for closing this migratory station are that (1) those who are not selected for recruitment at this point, because of its proximity to the border, proceed to enter the United States illegally, and (2) the influx of thousands of agricultural workers into Monterrey creates a very serious community problem.

In these connections it might be pointed out that the closing of the migratory station at Monterrey in 1952 in no sense diminished the number of illegal entrants into the United States. In fact, there is a strong basis for the conclusion that it may have aggravated the situation. Official figures of the United States Immigration and Naturalization Service show that for the fiscal year 1952, 703,778 illegal entrants were returned to Mexico and for the first 9 months of the fiscal year 1953 the figure is approximately 600,000, reflecting a substantial proportionate increase for the fiscal year 1953 with approximately 41 percent apprehended in the lower Rio Grande Valley of Texas.

If the closing of the migratory station at Monterrey was actuated by the desire of the Mexican Government to eliminate the community problem created by the influx of agricultural workers into the city, this action has not achieved its objective. According to information received from our representatives at Monterrey, from 10,000 to 15,000 agricultural workers have congregated at Monterrey and are remaining there in the hope that the migratory station will be opened. Many of these workers have been there for months without funds, without adequate food and shelter, and are at present presenting a very serious problem to the authorities. The reestablishment of a migratory station at Monterrey would obviously result in the removal of many of these workers from this area.

It is thus apparent that the closing of the station at Monterrey has not alleviated either of the situations which Mexico gives as its reasons for not honoring its obligations under article 4 of the Migrant Labor Agreement of 1951, as amended.

I am, accordingly, requesting that the Secretary of State through the American Embassy at Mexico City lodge a firm protest with the Mexican Government for its refusal to carry out its obligation under the Migrant Labor Agreement of 1951, as amended, to maintain a migratory station at Monterrey.

The second very serious matter which has been brought to my attention is a declaration of the Mexican Government, in open meeting during the recent conversations held in Mexico City between representatives of this Government and Mexico, that effective May 1, 1953, Mexico will demand, as a condition precedent to the contracting of

Mexican workers for employment in the United States, a general 10 percent increase in beginning wages. While the Mexican Government has not confirmed this by note, the United States representatives were advised that this demand was being presented at the request of the Secretary of the Mexican Ministry for Foreign Relations.

The determination of prevailing agricultural wages in this country for the purposes of the Migrant Labor Agreement of 1951, as amended, is, by the express language of article 15 of that agreement, the responsibility of the Secretary of Labor of the United States. Previous efforts of the Mexican officials to refuse to permit the contracting of Mexican workers, except at wage rates set by them, have been vigorously protested by this Government and in June 1952 necessitated taking the issue to the then Secretary of the Mexican Ministry for Foreign Relations, Senor Manuel Tello. As a result of these conversations, a clear understanding was reached with Mexico that the determination of prevailing and beginning wages is, under the Migrant Labor Agreement, the responsibility of the Secretary of Labor of the United States and not of the Mexican Government, and that Mexico would not undertake to fix either prevailing or beginning wages in this country.

The recent demand of the Mexican Government for a 10 percent increase in wages for Mexican nationals contracted for agricultural employment in this country is a repudiation by Mexico of the agreement reached in June 1952 with Senor Tello and is without any authority under the Migrant Labor Agreement of 1951, as amended.

I would appreciate it, therefore, if you would also file a vigorous protest with the Mexican Government advising it that this Government views its demand for a 10 percent general increase in beginning wages for Mexican nationals contracted for agricultural employment in the United States as a serious violation of the Migrant Labor Agreement of 1951, as amended.

There is also a third matter which I believe should be taken care of at this time. I would appreciate your replying to note No. 132647 dated September 24, 1952, from the Ministry for Foreign Relations of the Republic of Mexico which sets forth its interpretation of article 27 of the Migratory Labor Agreement.

In view of the arrangements pending at that time for the discussion of joint interpretations, no reply was dispatched to the note of the Mexican Ministry. Between the dates of March 23, 1953, and April 9, 1953, discussions were held in Mexico City between representatives of this Department and the Mexican Government relative to the preparation of joint interpretations, including the interpretation of article 27. A proposed joint interpretation of article 27 was submitted to the Mexican Government at that time. No final agreement, however, was reached on this article in these discussions and the matter was left unresolved. I request, therefore, that you submit the following text as our proposal for a joint interpretation of article 27:

"Prior to any transfer of workers from one employer to another under the provisions of article 27, the appropriate Mexican Consul will be given 10 days' notice of the proposed transfer, the name of the employer, and the area to which the workers are to be transferred. To the extent possible, all information and documentation required to be furnished by the new employer as a condition of contracting Mexican nationals will be submitted to the Mexican Consul before the date set for recontracting and transfer.

"The Mexican Consul will, as promptly as possible, indicate to the representative of the Secretary of Labor, whether or not he has

any objections to the transfer. If he has objections, he will indicate the respects in which he objects in order that appropriate steps may be taken to remove the objections, if possible.

"The Mexican Government will in all cases arrange for a representative of its government to be present at the place of recontracting and transfer when the recontracting is carried out. No contracts will be executed for the transfer of workers and no workers will be transferred to new employers without the consent and supervision of the appropriate Mexican Consul or the authorized representative of the Mexican Government.

"Nothing contained in this interpretation shall be construed to modify the requirements to adhere to the procedures provided in articles 7 and 8 of the Migrant Labor Agreement of 1951, as amended."

We are firmly of the opinion that this proposal would afford the Mexican Government every reasonable opportunity to protect the interests of its nationals and to exercise its prerogative to recall any Mexican workers whom it did not want recontracted.

Yours very truly,

Secretary of Labor.

NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL WORKERS UNION,
El Centro, Calif., May 4, 1953.

Mr. ANTHONY FIGUEROA,
United States Bureau of Employment
Security, El Centro, Calif.

DEAR MR. FIGUEROA: In our telephone conversation of this morning I advised you that a number of Mexican contract nationals have joined this union; that they are regular dues-paying members in good standing; and that we consider that by the act of joining the union these workers have elected to designate the union as their representative.

My interpretation of article 21 of the International Executive Agreement is that the Mexican nationals have the right to join the union; that we have a right to represent them vis-a-vis the employer for direct discussion and settlement of grievances; and that the employer is bound to recognize the union as the representative of the nationals.

The position which I understood you to take is that we may not represent the Nationals directly before the employer, but only through the Department of Labor and the Mexican consul.

I expressed to you my complete disagreement with your view and we agreed that I would immediately submit in writing the substance of our fundamental divergence. It is my understanding that you will consult the policymaking officials of your agency and request a clarification of the matter.

We would be very interested to receive the views of the Department of Labor in this connection at the earliest possible date.

Sincerely yours,

ERNESTO GALARZA.

CALIFORNIA FARM LABOR ASSOCIATION,
Los Angeles, Calif., May 11, 1953.

To All Members:

We have just received reliable information that Mexico, because of extreme pressure from the United States Department of Labor, has reluctantly agreed that article 21, of the international agreement will be interpreted to mean that Mexican national agricultural workers can be represented by anyone, including American unions.

We have been given to understand that Mexico opposed having their workers represented by American unions and suggested that the representatives be either from their own group or from a Mexican union. However, because of the pressure (and we are

wondering what new concession has been made) Mexico agreed to the interpretation as desired by the Department of Labor. Instructions have not, as yet, gone out to the field, but union activity is already underway to secure workers' petitions naming a union organizer as their representative.

We request that you wire your Congressman, as well as your Senators, urging them to take immediate action to restore the wording of article 21 so as to restrict representation to a member of their own group. Ask them to check with Congressman JOHN PHILLIPS (California) regarding concerted action on this important matter.

This latest action on the part of the union-minded Department of Labor is just another reason why the Farm Placement Service must be transferred to the Department of Agriculture without delay.

This matter is urgent—get your wires off today.

ELLIS S. COMAN,
Secretary-Treasurer.

MAJOR DISTRIBUTING CO.,
Salinas, Calif., May 12, 1953.

Senator WILLIAM KNOWLAND,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR KNOWLAND: We have just received reliable information that Mexico, because of extreme pressure from the United States Department of Labor, has reluctantly agreed that article 21 of the International Agreement will be interpreted to mean that Mexican national agricultural workers can be represented by anyone, including American unions.

We have been given to understand that Mexico opposed having their workers represented by American unions and suggested that the representatives be either from their own group or from a Mexican union. However, because of the pressure (and we are wondering what new concession has been made) Mexico agreed to the interpretation as desired by the Department of Labor. Instructions have not, as yet, gone out to the field, but union activity is already under way to secure workers' petitions naming a union organizer as their representative.

We urge you to take immediate action to restore the wording of article 21 so as to restrict representation to a member of their own group. I believe that Congressman JOHN PHILLIPS is spearheading concerted action on this important matter.

Yours very truly,

S. V. CHRISTIERTSON.

LOS ANGELES CALIF., May 15, 1953.
Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Re article 21 of labor agreement, understand Mashburn states no amendment agreed on. Such statement is smokescreen as present negotiations in Mexico are not to amend agreement but to agree on interpretation of existing articles. Labor Department officials intend to force unionization on now unorganized farm workers. On February 11 this year Durkin stated, "In administering the farm labor program the Department of Labor will not inject itself into labor-management relations." Apparent someone has forgotten who someone said. Application of desired interpretation permitting American unions represent Mexican contract workers will result in end of Mexican supplemental supply program. This is serious situation and official doubletalk should be carefully analyzed.

Regards,

WILLIAM H. TOLBERT,
Chairman, National Farm Labor Users
Committee, Santa Paula, Calif.

JUDICIAL REVIEW OF CERTAIN DECISIONS OF GOVERNMENT CONTRACTING OFFICERS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 24) to permit judicial review of decisions of Government contracting officers involving questions of fact arising under Government contracts in cases other than those in which fraud is alleged.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the Supreme Court on November 26, 1951, handed down a decision which has had a great impact upon the contractors of the United States. It was a decision which shocked many lawyers and others who dislike the concept of completely closing all avenues of judicial review with respect to any class of administrative decisions.

I refer to the decision in the case of United States against Wunderlich, and others.

What this decision held, in essence, was that in any case of dispute over a matter of fact in connection with a Government contract, the decision of the contracting officer or the department head must stand, in the absence of fraudulent conduct; and the Court says that in order to claim fraud a plaintiff must allege and prove "conscious wrongdoing, an intent to cheat or be dishonest," on the part of the Government contracting officer.

As Mr. Justice Douglas pointed out in his dissent, this decision necessarily has "wide application and a devastating effect." It amounts to giving the contracting officer absolute authority to determine facts relating to execution of the contract. It would operate in almost every case to prohibit any review of a dispute by the courts, for it would be a practical impossibility to allege and prove fraud upon the part of the Government, in the term stated by the Supreme Court.

Mr. President, I particularly invite the attention of the Senate to the following:

Mr. Justice Minton, who wrote this opinion, stated in the course of it that "if the standard of fraud that we adhere to is too limited, that is a matter for Congress."

It is, indeed, a matter for Congress, Mr. President; and Congress should deal with it by passing this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARTIN in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to permit review of decisions of Government contracting officers involving questions of fact arising under Government contracts in cases other than those in which fraud is alleged, and for other purposes."

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued July 7, 1953
For actions of July 6, 1953
83rd-1st, No. 123

CONTENTS

Animal diseases.....4	Expenditures.....19	Lands, grazing.....13,21
Appropriations.....26	Food inspection.....12	Loans, farm.....5,8,10,17
Consumer interests...16,23	Foreign aid.....18	Oleomargarine.....6
Crop insurance.....3	Forestry.....2	Price discrimination.15,25
Disaster relief.....5	Intergovernmental rela- tions.....22	Property acquisition.....9
Drought relief.....5,10,17	Labor, farm.....1	Sec. 32 funds.....5
Education.....11	Land transfer.....7	Treaties.....24
Electrification.....14,20		

HIGHLIGHTS:

Senate passed bills to continue Mexican farm-labor program, extend forest survey to Alaska, continue crop-insurance expansion, and authorize additional animal-disease control. Sen. Johnson, Tex., urged use of Sec. 32 funds for drought relief. House committee voted to report drought-relief bill. Sen. Schoepfel favored Government livestock purchases for drought relief.

SENATE

1. FARM LABOR. Passed as reported H. R. 3480, to continue the Mexican farm labor program. The Senate version provides for a 1-year extension, whereas the House version provides for a 3-year extension. (pp. 8227-8.)
2. FORESTRY. Passed as reported S. 725, to amend the McNary-McSweeney Forest Research Act so as to make it clear that the comprehensive forest survey provided for in that Act may be extended to the U. S. territories and possessions (pp. 8241-2).
Passed as reported S. 894, to convey a tract of national forest land at Basalt, Colo., to Alfred H. Sloss (p. 8242).
3. CROP INSURANCE. Passed as reported S. 1367, to extend for 2 years the authority of FCIC to expand the crop-insurance program into additional counties (p. 8242).
4. ANIMAL DISEASES. Passed without amendment S. 2055, to authorize the Department to control and eradicate scrapie and blue tongue in sheep, and also incipient or potentially serious minor outbreaks of diseases of animals, without the necessity of declaring an emergency which must be based on a threat to the livestock industry (pp. 8242-3).
5. DISASTER RELIEF. Passed as reported S. 2199, to allow States during major disasters to use or distribute certain surplus equipment and supplies of the Federal Government (p. 8243).
Sen. Johnson, Tex., recommended use of \$118,000,000 of Sec. 32 funds for drought relief (pp. 8252-8).

6. OLEOMARGARINE. Discussed and, at the request of Sen. Case, passed over S. 1806, to permit the Navy to serve oleomargarine (p. 8232).
7. LAND TRANSFER. Discussed and, at the request of Sen. Smathers, passed over S. 1400, to permit release of the reversionary rights to a rural-rehabilitation land tract in Wake County, N. C., and S. 2163, to authorize conveyance of the U. S. cotton field station near Statesville, N. C., to that State (p. 8243).
8. FARM LOANS. At the request of Sen. Gore, passed over S. 1276, to increase the interest rate on farm-tenant loans (p. 8243).
9. PROPERTY ACQUISITION. Received a Colo. Legislature resolution favoring limits on Government acquisition of private property (p. 8223).

HOUSE

10. DROUGHT RELIEF. The Agriculture Committee ordered reported (but did not actually report) with amendments H. R. 6054, to provide emergency aid to farmers and stockmen in the drought areas (p. D659).
11. EDUCATION. The Education and Labor Committee reported (July 3) without amendment H. R. 6049, to provide school-construction assistance in federally affected areas (H. Rept. 702), and H. R. 6078, to extend and improve the act providing aid to federally affected local educational agencies (H. Rept. 703)(p. 8281).
12. FOOD INSPECTION. The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee reported without amendment H. R. 5740, to permit factory, warehouse, etc., inspection by the Food and Drug Administration after first giving written notice to the owner (H. Rept. 708)(p. 8281).
13. GRAZING LANDS. Rep. Netcalf spoke in favor of his bill, H. R. 6081, to amend the Taylor Grazing Act so as to provide for more representative district advisory boards, authorize a multiple-use program, etc. (pp. 8275-6).
14. ELECTRIFICATION. An Interior and Insular Affairs subcommittee approved for reporting to the full Committee H. R. 3598, to consolidate the Parker Dam power project and the Davis Dam project (p. D659).
15. PRICE DISCRIMINATION. Received a National Association of Retail Grocers petition urging support of S. 1357, to strengthen the Robinson-Patman Act (p. 8281).

BILLS INTRODUCED

16. CONSUMER INTERESTS. S. Res. 128-134, by Sen. Gillette, to direct various standing committees to investigate and study matters affecting consumer interests; to the various committees affected (pp. 8224-6).

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

17. DROUGHT RELIEF. Extension of remarks of Sen. Schoeppel favoring Government purchases of livestock to aid drought-stricken farmers and cattlemen, including a newspaper article showing the farm outlook in the drought areas (pp. A4334-5).
Rep. Price inserted three newspaper articles discussing the drought and claiming that the cattlemen who only recently wanted nothing from the Government except to be let alone now welcome drought aid (pp. A4309-10, 4311, 4314-5).

sideration of measures to which there is no objection.

BILLS INCLUDED IN THE CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senate bill 16, Calendar 153, may be included in the call of the calendar today. The bill was before the Senate on previous occasions, and was discussed at length for 2 or 3 hours. Each time no quorum was present, and the Senate was forced to adjourn without taking action on it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Nevada, so far as the acting majority leader is concerned, I have no objection to the bill being included in the call of the calendar today, unless there is some reason why the calendar committees would object.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I may say for the benefit of Senators that, at the request of the Senator from Ohio, the bill will be objected to if it is called on the calendar.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Would the Senator from New Jersey have any objection to its being called up?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. No.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to including Calendar 153 in the call of the calendar today? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar No. 264, H. R. 3480, to amend section 509 of title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, to extend for 3 years the period during which agricultural workers may be made available for employment under such title, be included in today's call of the calendar.

The bill deals with the extension of the Mexican Farm Labor Act. As Senators will recall, consideration of the bill has been postponed on several occasions, and I believe it is the understanding of Senators that the bill would come up today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Again, on the same basis, I do not know what instructions may have been left with the calendar committees in connection with the bill. However, so far as having it included on the calendar is concerned, I have no objection to that being done.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand there is no objection to the consideration and passage of the bill today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill will be included in today's call of the calendar.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be included in today's call of the calendar Order of Business 389, Senate bill 1396, to authorize the adoption of certain rules with respect to the broadcasting or telecasting of professional baseball exhibitions in interstate commerce, and for other purposes. I spoke to the acting majority leader about it on Saturday.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Again, without any commitment on the part of the calendar committees as to what their position will

be, I have no objection to including the bill in today's call of the calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Colorado? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The clerk will call Calendar No. 153, Senate bill 16.

GRANTING OF IMMUNITY TO WITNESSES BEFORE EITHER HOUSE OF CONGRESS OR THEIR COMMITTEES—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 16) to amend the immunity provisions relating to testimony given by witnesses before either House of Congress or their committees was announced as first in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I have an objection to it, by request, but I shall withhold it if the Senator from Nevada wishes to make a statement.

Mr. McCARRAN. I should like to make a statement, and I would appreciate it if the Senator from Florida would withhold making his objection.

Mr. President, it has become obvious that this bill cannot pass on a call of the calendar. This is the bill to close a loophole in the existing immunity statute with respect to witnesses before congressional committees, so as to effectuate the purpose of that statute and put the Congress and its committees in a position to secure the testimony of a witness even though the witness may elect to enter a claim of privilege under the fifth amendment. This would be accomplished, as Senators know, by extending to the witness an immunity from prosecution equally as broad as the fifth amendment privilege which he claims.

I have sought information with respect to the intentions of the majority leadership with respect to this bill. I renew my request for information on that point.

I respectfully call the attention of the acting majority leader to the statement of the majority leader, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], who on May 12, 1953, the day on which he moved to displace this bill by taking up the proposal with respect to temporary economic controls, said:

Under all the circumstances I think it would be better to lay the bill aside temporarily. I can assure the Senator from North Carolina that within 2 weeks, or a reasonable time, I shall move to take up the bill again.

Mr. President, I wish to know whether the acting majority leader will let the bill come before the Senate and remain before the Senate for the necessary time, which in my opinion will not exceed 3 hours at the utmost, and probably will be a much shorter period of time, to secure a determination by the whole Senate, through a vote, as to whether the bill should or should not pass.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I assume that the Senator from Nevada is addressing his inquiry to me. In view of the statement made by the majority leader of the Senate, the Senator from

Ohio [Mr. TAFT], who is temporarily away from his duties, and in view of the statement of the Senator from Nevada that he believes debate on the bill to which he has referred will not exceed 2 or 3 hours, I would hope that sometime during the week—and I shall discuss the matter with the majority policy committee tomorrow—after we finish action on the Labor-Federal Security appropriation bill, and perhaps before the next appropriation bill is ready, opportunity may be afforded to consider the bill.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I object to the present consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection being heard, the bill will be passed over.

MR. AND MRS. JOSEPH W. FURSTENBERG

The bill (H. R. 662) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Joseph W. Furstenberg was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EMPLOYMENT OF MEXICAN FARM LABOR

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3480) to amend section 509 of title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, to extend for 3 years the period during which agricultural workers may be made available for employment under such title which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with an amendment, in line 5, after "December 31", to strike out "1956" and insert "1954."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to amend section 509 of title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, to extend for 1 year the period during which agricultural workers may be made available for employment under such title."

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the bill just passed provides for a 1-year extension of the Mexican farm labor program. The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry recommended a 1-year extension, instead of a 3-year extension, because the Department of Labor is making an intensive study of the program and our negotiations with Mexico. It is felt any further extension of the program should be considered along with the results of the study.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a correction which was made with respect to the report accompanying the bill.

There being no objection, the correction of the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 2 of the committee report on H. R. 3480, it was stated that construction of the 5 migration centers in the Republic of Mexico and the 5 reception centers on the border cost more than \$1 million. The statement is incorrect as the costs referred to are

administrative costs for the year beginning February 1, 1952. The migration centers in Mexico are furnished by the Mexican Government and the reception centers on the border are rented, with the growers paying approximately 80 percent of the cost of the rent. Rents and utilities for all reception and migration centers including the construction of kitchen and sanitary facilities at the Harlingen Reception Center from the beginning of the program total \$150,202. The estimated cost for all objects including rent, construction, and administration from the beginning of the program to June 30, 1953 is \$2,166,930.

DISTRIBUTION OF TRUST FUNDS HELD BY SHOSHONE AND ARAPAHO TRIBES OF THE WIND RIVER RESERVATION

The bill (H. R. 444) to amend the act of May 19, 1947, so as to increase the percentage of certain trust funds held by the Shoshone and Arapaho Tribes of the Wind River Reservation which is to be distributed per capita to individual members of such tribes was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SMATHERS. May we have an explanation of the bill, Mr. President?

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, the purpose of this bill is to increase the per capita payments to the members of the Shoshone and Arapaho Indian Tribes in Wyoming. Under legislation that I sponsored several years ago when I was a Member of the House, these Indians were allowed semiannual per capita payments equal to two-thirds of the receipts from royalties on oil and gas produced on their own tribal lands. This bill merely increases the proportion distributed from two-thirds to 80 percent of the receipts. The money involved belongs exclusively to the Indians.

I may say to my good friend, the junior Senator from Florida, that the Indians have handled this money in a very satisfactory fashion. Not all of the money received from these sources is distributed. It was thought then that if \$1 million were kept in the trust funds from the receipts, that would be entirely adequate for any emergency purpose. Even after distributing two-thirds of the income the remaining one-third has increased the funds remaining in the Treasury to the credit of the tribes totaling nearly \$3 million. These funds draw 4 percent interest.

As I have said, the purpose of this bill is to permit these Indians to use a trifle more of their own money—the difference between two-thirds and 80 percent. The record is that they have done an admirable job of managing their own business and providing for themselves, and they have made great progress in the past 6 years.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 444) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REGULATION OF LIFE INSURANCE IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The bill (S. 879) to amend section 12 of chapter V of the act of June 19, 1934, as amended, entitled "An act to regulate the business of life insurance in the District of Columbia" was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, there is also on the calendar House bill 2582, Calendar No. 458, which is identical with Senate bill 879.

I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 2582, Calendar No. 458, in lieu of Senate bill 879. The reason is that the House bill has already been passed by the House.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Maryland.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2582) to amend section 12 of chapter V of the act of June 19, 1934, as amended, entitled "An act to regulate the business of life insurance in the District of Columbia."

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the further consideration of Senate bill 879 be indefinitely postponed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INCORPORATION OF NATIONAL FUND FOR MEDICAL EDUCATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1748) to incorporate the National Fund for Medical Education.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I desire to point out that the amendments to the bill were agreed to during its consideration on a former call of the calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct.

The bill is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 1748) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following persons: Donald C. Balfour, Rochester, Minn.; Margaret Culin Banning, Duluth, Minn.; E. N. Beesley, Indianapolis, Ind.; James F. Bell, Minneapolis, Minn.; Mary McLeod Bethune, Daytona Beach, Fla.; Elmer H. Bobst, New York, N. Y.; Henry C. Brunie, New York, N. Y.; Earl Bunting, Washington, D. C.; Carl Byoir, New York, N. Y.; Colby M. Chester, New York, N. Y.; Champ Carry, Chicago, Ill.; Paul F. Clark, Boston, Mass.; Lucius D. Clay, New York, N. Y.; S. Sloan Colt, Westhampton Beach, N. Y.; William E. Cotter, Scarsdale, N. Y.; C. R. Cox, New York, N. Y.; Howard S. Cullman, New York, N. Y.; Walter J. Cummings, Chicago, Ill.;

Raoul E. Desvernine, Washington, D. C.; Michael Francis Doyle, Philadelphia, Pa.; Victor Emanuel, New York, N. Y.; Theodore

R. Gamble, New York, N. Y.; Bernard F. Gimbel, Greenwich, Conn.; William B. Given, Jr., New York, N. Y.; David M. Heyman, New York, N. Y.; Oveta Culp Hobby, Houston, Tex.; Herbert Hoover, New York, N. Y.; B. Brewster Jennings, Glen Head, N. Y.; Eric A. Johnston, Washington, D. C.; Devereux C. Josephs, New York, N. Y.; Meyer Kestnbaum, Chicago, Ill.; Allan B. Kline, Chicago, Ill.; Edgar Kobak, New York, N. Y.;

Frank H. Lahey, Boston, Mass.; Robert Lehman, New York, N. Y.; Samuel D. Leidesdorf, New York, N. Y.; Leroy A. Lincoln, New York, N. Y.; Ralph Lowell, Boston, Mass.; Benjamin E. Mays, Atlanta, Ga.; Neil McElroy, Cincinnati, Ohio; George W. Merck, West Orange, N. J.; George G. Montgomery, San Francisco, Calif.; Seeley G. Mudd, Los Angeles, Calif.; Charles S. Munson, New York, N. Y.;

Herschel D. Newsom, Washington, D. C.; Edward J. Noble, New York, N. Y.; William S. Paley, New York, N. Y.; Thomas I. Parkinson, New York, N. Y.; F. D. Patterson, Tuskegee, Ala.; Joseph M. Proskauer, New York, N. Y.; B. Earl Puckett, New York, N. Y.; Victor F. Ridder, New York, N. Y.; Owen J. Roberts, Philadelphia, Pa.; Winthrop Rockefeller, New York, N. Y.; Anna M. Rosenberg, New York, N. Y.; T. J. Ross, New York, N. Y.; Howard A. Rusk, New York, N. Y.;

Lester N. Selig, Chicago, Ill.; Eustace Seligman, New York, N. Y.; Spyros P. Skouras, New York, N. Y.; Alfred P. Sloan, Jr., New York, N. Y.; Harold E. Stassen, Washington, D. C.; J. P. Stevens, Jr., New York, N. Y.; W. C. Stolk, New York, N. Y.; Juan T. Trippe, Greenwich, Conn.; Thomas J. Watson, New York, N. Y.; Ernest T. Weir, Pittsburgh, Pa.; George Whitney, New York, N. Y.; Robert E. Wilson, Chicago, Ill.; Robert W. Woodruff, Atlanta, Ga.; John S. Zinsser, Philadelphia, Pa.; and their successors, are hereby created and declared to be a body corporate by the name of the National Fund for Medical Education (hereinafter referred to as the corporation) and by such name shall be known and have perpetual succession of the powers, limitations, and restrictions herein contained.

PURPOSES OF CORPORATION

SEC. 2. The purposes of the corporation shall be to promote and foster the following objectives:

(1) The interpretation of the needs of medical education to the American public;

(2) The encouragement of the growth, development, and advancement of constantly improving standards and methods in the education and training of all medical manpower in the Nation;

(3) The preservation of academic freedom in the institutions of medical education and the aiding of these institutions in offering the equality of educational opportunity to all those who are qualified to seek to enter the medical profession.

USE OF INCOME AND ASSETS

SEC. 3. No part of the income or assets of the corporation shall enure to any of its members, directors, or officers, or to any individual, or be distributable to any of them during the life of the corporation or upon its dissolution or final liquidation. Nothing in this subsection, however, shall be construed to prevent the payment of compensation to officers of the corporation in amounts approved by the executive committee of the corporation.

NONPOLITICAL NATURE OF CORPORATION

SEC. 4. The corporation, and its officers and directors as such, shall not contribute to or otherwise support or assist any political party or candidate for elected public office.

TRUSTEES

SEC. 5. The directors of the corporation shall be termed trustees, and the first board of trustees shall consist of the 13 persons whose names and addresses are as follows:



Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued July 29, 1953
For actions of July 28, 1953
83rd-1st, No. 142

CONTENTS

Accounting.....45	Farm program.....12	Penalty mail.....17
Acreage allotments.....10	F.H.A.....35	Personnel.9,10,16,28,45,46
Agricultural	Food.....37	Postal rates.....17,19
appropriations.....43	Foreign aid.....37	Price supports.....33
Animal diseases.....14	Forestry.....13,14,48	Property.....21,26,32
Appropriations	Fur.....14,39	Reclamation.....18
.....2,10,11,15,43	Immigration.....4,22,41	Research.....24
Contracts.....47	Labor, farm.....3,29	Retirement.....29
Cattle industry.....33	Land laws.....44	Rubber.....20
Commodities.....1,30	Lands, public.....5,36	R.E.A.....11
Corn.....10	Lands, transfer.....24	St. Lawrence seaway.....38
Customs simplification..23	Legislative program....25	Surplus commodities...1,30
Drought relief.....2,10,35	Loans, farm.....6,35	Taxation.....16
Electrification.....11,31	Loans, forestry.....13,48	Trade, foreign.....23
Expenditures.....9	Loans, fur.....14,39	Transportation.....8
Famine relief.....13,30	Loans, home.....27	Veterans' benefits.....27
Farm production.....40	Organization.....42	Water conservation.....34
Farm labor.....3,29	Payrolling.....16	Wheat agreement.....13
Farm prices.....7		

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate passed sale of surplus commodities to foreign countries and drought-relief appropriation bills. House Rules Committee cleared famine relief, forest-loans, and Wheat Agreement bills. House committees reported Alaska forest survey, fur-farmer loans, and animal-disease bills. Mexican farm-labor bill sent to conference. House passed immigration bill. House agreed to Senate amendments to customs-simplification bill.

SENATE

- 1. SURPLUS COMMODITIES.** Passed with amendment S. 2475, which authorizes the President (1) to sell surplus agricultural commodities for foreign currencies and (2) to convert into dollars foreign currencies acquired by private exporters of such commodities. The total value of CCC stocks and funds which might be made available for these operations would be \$500 million. The Corporation would be reimbursed from appropriations made for that purpose or, in the case of local currencies used for the purposes of the Mutual Security Act, from ISA funds. (pp. 10424-37.)
- 2. APPROPRIATIONS.** Passed as reported H. J. Res. 305, the drought-relief appropriation measure (pp. 10423-4). As passed by the Senate, this proposal carries the same amounts as the House version, and there was only one technical amendment. Both Houses agreed to the conference reports on H. R. 5471, the D. C. appropriation bill; H. R. 4663, the first independent offices appropriation bill; and H. R. 5246, the Labor-HEW appropriation bill (pp. 10416-22, 10326-33). These bills will now be sent to the President.
The Appropriations Committee reported with amendments H. R. 5805, the legislative-judiciary appropriation bill (S. Rept. 687)(p. 10405).
- 3. FARM LABOR.** Senate and House conferees were appointed on H. R. 3480, to continue

the Mexican farm labor program (pp. 10333-4, 10474).

4. IMMIGRATION. Began debate on S. 1917, to authorize the issuance of special visas to certain refugees, etc. (pp. 10443-73).
5. PUBLIC LANDS. Senate conferees were appointed on S. 1397, to clarify the status of certain mining claims, and S. 2220, to amend the mineral leasing laws with respect to their application in the case of pipelines passing through the public domain (p. 10426).
6. FARM LOANS. Received from this Department a proposed bill to further amend Sec. 13 of the Federal Farm Loan Act to authorize the Federal land banks to make a bulk purchase of certain remaining assets of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation; to Agriculture and Forestry Committee (p. 10405). Also received in the House; to Agriculture Committee (p. 10400).
7. FARM PRICES. Sen. Humphrey inserted local statements favoring more action to assure adequate farm prices (p. 10405).
8. TRANSPORTATION. Agreed, as reported, to S. Res. 140, to provide for a study of transportation facilities in the D. C. area, which had been reported with amendments earlier in the day (S. Rept. 693) (p. 10410).
9. EXPENDITURES; PERSONNEL. The Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures submitted a report on Federal employment, etc. (pp. 10411-4).
10. SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1954. In reporting this bill, H. R. 6200 (see Digest 141), the committee took the following actions:
Added an item of \$3,000,000 to formulate and carry out corn acreage allotments for the 1954 crop, compared with a Budget estimate of \$7,500,000. The committee report states: "The Committee is of the opinion that if economy is practiced, the sum of \$3 million will be adequate. However, if it is found that this is not possible, the committee will consider a reasonable supplemental request at the next session of Congress."
Inserted a provision that the funds appropriated by Public Law 371, 82nd Cong., for drought relief shall remain available until Dec. 31, 1954.
Added the following general provision: "Funds made available in this or any other Act shall hereafter be available for examination of estimates in the field and the use of such funds for such purpose shall be subject only to regulations by the standing committees concerned."
Added a general provision limiting the use of chauffeurs.
11. INTERIOR APPROPRIATION BILL. In reporting this bill, H. R. 4828 (see Digest 141), the House conferees made the following statement regarding Southwestern Power Administration: "None of the funds allowed are to be used for the purpose of implementing existing contracts with REA cooperatives which provide for the lease-purchase of transmission or generating facilities. The funds may be used only for the purchase of electric power and energy and the payment of wheeling service charges at rates and in amounts comparable to those paid in the Southwestern Power Administration area under existing contracts based only on use value received with no additional allowance for purchase or lease of facilities. Such arrangements may be made with REA cooperatives in the area but no funds for this purpose are to be available after February 28, 1954."

HOUSE

12. FARM PROGRAM. On July 27 the Agriculture Committee issued a statement reading in part as follows:

Mr. Speaker, I am not disposed to detain the House any longer, but, I repeat, we have committed a grave mistake in adopting this conference report. However, in view of the fact that the House has already voted on this provision of the bill, and in view of the fact that the conferees made no changes in the bill, I shall not ask for another rollcall vote on this matter.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BATTLE].

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, this conference report cuts out at least 2,675 housing units from my district in Jefferson County, Ala. The House voted to eliminate all public housing, but the conferees compromised with the Senate and agreed to the construction of 20,000 units this year. Mr. Speaker, it is clear here today that the House is going along with the 20,000 units, but I must respectfully point out that as the situation now stands Alabama and especially Jefferson County will be hit a very, very hard blow. Alabama, South Carolina, and possibly other States will lose just about all the units under planning at this time as they have not reached the stage of executed Federal-State contributions contracts and as I understand it even those are in doubt. Passing this report which does not even set up a system of proportionate distribution means penalizing communities that have invested time, money, and effort in these projects, to say nothing of the money the Federal Government has already spent for planning surveys. As I said, in the Ninth Congressional District of Alabama alone there is at least 2,675 units that come under this category. They include Adamsville, 115; Birmingham, 2,000; Brookside, 6; Gardendale, 62; Graysville, 74; Kimberly, 62; Leeds, 18; Mulga, 230; Trussville, 34; and Warrior, 74.

Mr. Speaker, there is not a lot more that I can say in this one-half minute allotted to me today, but I protest discrimination against Alabama and Jefferson County and hope the Republicans will devise a fair system of distribution of these 20,000 units.

(Mr. BATTLE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, my position on this matter is very well known. I think we make a great mistake in social policy in adopting this report and cutting off the public housing program. I realize the situation, that the House has spoken.

But I do not join with my colleague from Illinois in interring the Federal public housing program. On the contrary, I point out that in 1937 we authorized a Federal public housing program, and it subsequently lay dormant for almost 10 years. In 1949 it was revived. I was happy to be the House sponsor of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner Act which was ultimately adopted by the House in 1949.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. I would say to the gentleman that if it is revived it will have to be as a result of the Democratic Party taking control of the Congress.

Mr. JAVITS. I do not agree with that at all. I have pointed out before and I point out again that you could never get the Federal public-housing program through without Republican votes, as you had to have before. This is not a question of party. It is a question of a social point of view. A Federal public-housing program is important enough in proportion to the total housing in the United States that its vitality will, I believe, bring it out for further consideration.

I should like to make one other point which I direct seriously to the chairman of the subcommittee. The United States took, as I see it, firm obligations in a governmental sense under the terms of the law and their expressed intent to build the units for which it made annual contributions contracts. Under this conference report the Congress is allowing only about two-fifths of the total under annual contributions contracts to be built. It seems to me that we are in duty bound, both morally and ethically and according to the terms of the law, to construct the balance of this housing. Many municipalities have put much effort and investment into these projected developments.

I look forward to two things: First, that the vitality of this Federal public-housing program will bring about its restoration, and, second, that we will authorize the construction of all those projects which are under annual contribution contracts that are so essential to slum clearance and urban redevelopment and on which enormous amounts of work have been done.

Mr. REGAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. REGAN. May I say to the gentleman that it would not be all of the Democrats who would vote for revival of this public-housing proposition.

Mr. JAVITS. I understand that. I think every Member knows that I consider every Member just as sincere as I am. Many of these programs do not divide down the middle of the aisle. They represent sectional and social points of view. As keenly as I feel on this subject of Federal public housing as a part of our total housing program including municipal and State projects, in justice to the people of our country, I know Members from some other communities feel just as keenly the other way.

I think it very important that we do not give up on our Federal public-housing program. I hope very much that my colleague from Illinois will work just as hard as I will to see that the Congress—whether Republican of my party, or Democrat of his party—will do what is just for the American people and that a fair percentage of the total housing for the country in Federal public-housing will be effectuated.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. I can only say to the gentleman that there certainly is no doubt as to my position in favor of the public-housing program. Now, in regard to what the gentleman from Texas [Mr. REGAN] said, let me state that all Democrats who follow the platform of the Democratic Party will be for public housing.

Mr. JAVITS. And I may also say that the Republicans who voted for the Housing Act of 1949 felt the same way about the Republican platform.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I hope the gentleman from Illinois will again back the program heartily and see that it goes through to a successful conclusion.

Mr. JAVITS. I trust that all men of good will will back the program.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. FERNANDEZ].

Mr. FERNANDEZ. The gentleman from California stated that the language in the committee report, which some of us felt prohibited the use of funds for safety and enforcement by the Interstate Commerce Commission, had been stricken.

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is correct.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. In the same statement the gentleman said that the item had been reduced by a good many thousand dollars. That is not the money that would be used for that purpose, is it?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Additional money was put in by the Senate, over and above the House figure, in order to put into effect the Wolf recommendations. That money was reduced \$65,000, which still leaves more than the House figure, and about \$300,000 more than last year.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. So that the money for the enforcement and safety work is still in the bill?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Yes. The \$65,000 came out of the additional sum put in by the Senate. The money allowed by the House for the safety function was not reduced.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1949

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 3480) to amend section 509 of title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, to extend for 3 years the period during which agricultural workers may be made available for employment under such title, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and

agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. HOPE, AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, HILL, COOLEY, and POAGE.

IMPORTATION OF TUNA PRODUCTS

(Mr. WILSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, it is increasingly evident that definite action must be taken with respect to the imposition of a duty and/or quota on the importation of tuna products. With this in mind I have introduced H. R. 6546, designed to place a needed overall quota on all types of tuna products imported into this country.

In introducing this bill and providing background for it, it is well to look at the current import figures:

For the first 5 months of 1953 frozen tuna imports totaled 32,653,000 pounds. This represented an increase of 34 percent over the highest comparable period and of 39 percent over 1952. Actually, there are only 3 years of record in which the annual total of frozen imports have exceeded this year's 5-month total.

For the same 5-months period canned tuna imports—in oil and in brine—totaled 11,952,000 pounds, or an increase of 19 percent over the highest comparable period which was in 1952.

There is no sign of any abatement in this growing increase in imports, either in relative or actual quantities. The latest announcement from Japan, the leading supplier of tuna products, is that current plans call for 72 million pounds of frozen tuna to be exported within a year, which amount is higher than the total of any single year's imports from all countries sending frozen tuna to the United States.

The goal on canned goods is approximately 30 million pounds of processed weight. This again is a figure beyond any year except 1950, when announcement of the end of the United States-Mexico Trade Agreement was made causing a most unusual situation, which, according to the United States Tariff Commission "gave an added stimulus to imports during the remainder of the year."

The most alarming thing about these estimates of exports is not only the fact that they are far beyond any previous year's total exports, but that they are given before the productive potential of the new Japanese fleet is realized. There is a program of purchasing motherships from this country which has been and is being actively followed. There is a major program of fishing vessel construction, which construction program has the financial assistance of the Japanese Government. It is only logical to assume that the export goals announced are only the beginning of much larger amounts possible when the additional productive facilities of the Japanese fleet are realized. Significantly, at this same time no new construction of major ves-

sels is being undertaken by the American tuna industry and not one new keel has been laid for a new vessel within the past 2 years.

In its report to the Committee on Finance of the United States Senate in March 1953, the Tariff Commission stated in part:

The extent to which the domestic tuna fleet and industry are exposed to foreign competition is actually governed by imports of both the raw and canned fish and it follows from what has been said that any desired limitation on imports of fresh or frozen tuna by the United States could probably be accomplished under present conditions more certainly by means of quotas rather than by duties.

The situation requires correction and some new thinking.

I have introduced H. R. 6546, designed to provide an overall solution by regulating the total quantity of tuna products which may be imported into the United States in any form and by providing a sliding scale whereby importations may be increased in absolute quantities as the market grows.

These are the things which H. R. 6546 will do:

First. Permit the entry of imported tuna products in all forms to come in at about the highest level they have reached, the equivalent of 120 million pounds of round weight.

Second. Permit the entry of amounts in excess of this quantity by the provision of a percentage share of the market, which would become operative as the average apparent annual consumption increases.

Third. Establish the percentage at 25 percent, which would be approximately double the prewar annual average.

Fourth. Establish the absolute quantity quota for the present at 120 million pounds of round weight, which would be more than 4 times the average of the prewar exportations to this country.

Fifth. Limit imports for the present to 120 million pounds until the apparent average annual consumption rises above the 480-million-pound mark, which could take place within the next year and a half.

Sixth. Permit the duty-free importation of frozen tuna from Peru and other American Republics up to a rate of 5 percent of the market, based on the preceding 5 years. In 1953 this would permit the importation of 21,200,000 pounds, a significant increase when compared to the total of 15,600,000 pounds actually received in 1952 and a 5-year average of 13,400,000 pounds.

GOVERNMENT-OWNED RUBBER-PRODUCING FACILITIES

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 5728) to authorize the disposal of the Government-owned rubber-producing facilities, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of July 27, 1953.)

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under the conference report on the so-called rubber bill a commission of 3 is set up by the President, at the pay of \$50 per diem, to advertise for bids from prospective buyers of the synthetic rubber plants of this country that were established and have been built up and developed during and since World War II.

That bidding period must continue for not less than 6 months in order to give small concerns or corporations as well as the larger ones an opportunity to bid.

After the bids have been received, the Commission, working in constant consultation and close cooperation with the Attorney General of the United States in order to produce a free, competitive synthetic industry in this country, making sure that there is no violation of the antitrust laws, has a period of not less than 7 months to negotiate with these prospective buyers.

The report of the Commission must be submitted to the Congress not later than January 31, 1955. You will recall that the House bill required that the report should be made by May 1, 1954, but I think the Senate was wise in extending the time in order to dispose of such a large industry. It gives everybody ample time and fair chance to bid. The House receded and agreed to the Senate amendment granting until January 31, 1955, for the Commission to submit its report to the Congress.

When that report is submitted and referred respectively to the Armed Services Committee of the House and the Banking and Currency Committee of the Senate, any Member of either body has the privilege of introducing a resolution registering disapproval of the same. If the committee to which the resolution is referred does not act within 10 days, the committee may be discharged and the resolution called up on the floor. If 30 days elapse and no resolution of disapproval is adopted by either House of the Congress, then the recommendations in the report are to be carried out and the sales consummated.

I want each Member to bear in mind that any Member has the right to introduce this privileged resolution of disapproval. But if either the House or the Senate rejects or disapproves the proposed sale, then the Rubber Act of 1948 will automatically be extended until March 31, 1956.

I might say that when the House conferees met with the Senate conferees yesterday we went into this matter very thoroughly and we reached this accord without too much wrangling or debate.

Once more I want to remind the Members of the House that we came dangerously near losing World War II when Malaya fell and the supply of our natural rubber was cut off. But when big Bill Jeffers brought order out of chaos and developed this synthetic industry at a cost of \$700 million, which we have built up and which is now a going concern, it saved not only our necks in World War

present discussion but I should proceed with my remarks on the pending bill.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. I should like to say that in the State of Nevada, in fact in all the area west of the Rocky Mountains, where it does not rain, we use cover crops for fertilizer and to enrich the soil and of course we control the time of irrigation.

And even in our country if the wheat acreage is limited, the farmer will spend a little more money in fertilizer and preparation of the soil and get a substantial increase in the production of grain. So I still say when the Congress limits acreage the incentive to increase production is there. The Department of Agriculture and the Congress should learn more of the practical aspects of farming—the farmer knows how.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator would allow farmers to do as they please; is that correct?

Mr. MALONE. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. And he would let them do so without any instructions from anyone; is that correct?

Mr. MALONE. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Perhaps they would return to the old days, within a very short period.

Mr. MALONE. We are building bins now for the third crop of corn and for the third crop of wheat. We have hungry cattle all over the Western States.

What we need desperately—if the Congress continues its farming on the Senate floor—is a receipt to feed \$3-per-hundred corn to \$20-per-hundred cattle.

Mr. ELLENDER. Of course, I admit that my friend, the Senator from Nevada, has a right to his own view; but on that, I am thoroughly in disagreement.

Mr. MALONE. Does the Senator mean that it is possible to feed \$3-per-hundred corn to \$20-per-hundred cattle?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, to revert to the pending bill—the subject I was discussing a while ago, before this interesting verbal exchange which I enjoyed very much, I would like to emphasize that we must keep the welfare of our own people uppermost in our minds. Things look good today. We have an abundance of food; we have plenty of wheat and plenty of corn; we have large amounts of cotton. But if there were proper distribution within our own country of these vast surpluses of food, we might find that we have less and less as the years go by. By the same token, we are bound to have less and less as the years pass, because of the increased population to which I have been referring.

As I indicated a while ago, our population increased last year by 3 million; if it continues to increase at the same rate, our population in 1975 will have reached something over 200 million. But, accepting the figures given by our experts, and taking the lower estimate, I think it is safe to say that by 1975 our population will be about 190 million. As I indicated a moment ago, the vast store of food has been produced upon

426 million acres now under cultivation; by 1975, in order to provide food for the 190 million people who will then occupy this great country—assuming we are to give them the same standard of living that we now enjoy—530 million acres of land will be required.

Where are we to get it? As I have just indicated, we now have about 462 million acres. We expect to obtain 15 million acres from the release of lands which are now used in the production of feed for horses and mules; from reclamation and irrigation we expect to obtain another 30 million acres. If those items are added together, they will give us a grand total of 507 million acres; yet in 1975, for us to have the same amount of land in proportion to our present population, we will require 530 million acres. In the face of these facts, our experts tell us that we will be short 23 million acres of land. We will be 23 million acres short of the goal we must have in order for our future population to enjoy a standard of living comparable to that which obtains in this country today.

I say, Mr. President, that we must take care of our own people first. We must not merely look to tomorrow; we must look 25 or 30 years hence, if we expect to maintain our heritage of plenty and if our grandchildren are to enjoy the same standard of living that you and I take for granted today.

Mr. President, I am hopeful that the pending bill will be defeated. Of course, it is perhaps only a futile hope. I realize that the gentleman at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue has stated that he wants this bill passed. It is one of the so-called must bills to be passed at the present session. Therefore, I have no hesitancy in saying it will be passed. I have been here for 16 or 17 years, during which time I have learned by experience what it means to have the Chief Executive back any piece of legislation which comes before the Senate for consideration. But, Mr. President, the proponents of the pending bill, as well as the President himself, are, in my opinion, shortsighted.

They are not looking far enough into the future of our own country to realize what may happen 25 or 30 or 40 years hence. If this land is to continue to progress, if our Nation is to maintain its position as leader and champion of the forces of freedom, we must remain strong economically. We cannot afford to weaken ourselves by inviting the peoples of other countries of the world to our shores, thereby causing overpopulation. We must realize that to do so would only invite to our own shores that which has caused such great trouble in so many areas of the world.

Mr. President, as I pointed out a while ago, the remedy for these people, residing in overpopulated areas, is for them to be willing to migrate into those parts of the world which are not so thickly populated. They should be willing to pioneer in such great countries as Brazil, Australia, and Canada, as I have indicated. I am sure these areas would offer much in the way of opportunity—ininitely more than the coun-

tries in which they are now located. But they are not willing to do this. Most of them have their sights aimed at America. They want to come here because they think the living is easy. But I can assure them that it would be better to go to countries like Brazil, as I have stated. There is a country, Mr. President, which has more land than the United States. It is as large as the United States, plus the great State of Texas. It has a population of only 52 million. It has millions of acres of land awaiting the plow, plus natural resources in abundance, where people could make a splendid living and could really get rich quickly, if only they were willing to pioneer as did our forefathers in this country years ago.

Mr. President, I would much prefer that we assist these people financially to find homes in friendly nations. It would be better for the Congress to appropriate money in order to help pay their expenses to sparsely populated foreign lands, rather than to the United States, and to assist them in developing the great resources of countries which remain practically untouched.

The United States has led the way. Now, we must make the world understand that we are physically unable to accept any more displaced persons. In addition, we should encourage the migration of these people to the underdeveloped areas of the world, where they can find an opportunity to build for themselves a new and more abundant life. There are areas that cry out loudly for people. There are places in the world that contain vast and virgin farmlands, great deposits of natural resources—in fact, all the necessities prerequisite to greatness except people. These are the places these people must go. In them, they will not harm but help. In them, they can—working as our own forefathers did—build a new and more abundant life.

It is my hope, Mr. President, that the pending measure will be defeated.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 6382) to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to extend until June 30, 1954, the period during which the General Services Administration may conduct negotiated sales of surplus property.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 247. An act for the relief of Frans Gunnink;

S. 385. An act for the relief of Anna Soleniani;

S. 754. An act for the relief of Ethel Hudson Morrison;

S. 781. An act for the relief of Dr. Jacob Griffel;

S. 815. An act for the relief of Steven M. Pivnicki;

S. 873. An act to amend the District of Columbia Credit Unions Act;

S. 953. An act for the relief of Mary Thalla Womack Webb;

S. 1197. An act granting the consent of Congress to the negotiation by the States of Nebraska, Wyoming, and South Dakota of certain compacts with respect to the use of waters common to two or more of said States;

S. 1273. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to incorporate the American University," approved February 24, 1893, so as to clarify the relations between the board of trustees of the American University and the board of education of the Methodist Church, and for other purposes;

S. 1393. An act to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Leave Act of 1949;

S. 1791. An act for the relief of Leong Walk Hong;

S. 1945. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide that the Board of Education of the District of Columbia shall have sole authority to regulate the vacation periods and annual leave of absence of certain school officers and employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia," approved March 5, 1952;

H. R. 665. An act for the relief of N. A. G. L. Moerings, Mrs. Bertha Johanna Krayenbrink Moerings, and Lambertus Karel Aloysius Josef Moerings;

H. R. 1329. An act for the relief of Arthur Oppenheimer, Jr., and Mrs. Jane Oppenheimer;

H. R. 1459. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mildred G. Kates and Ronald Kates;

H. R. 1802. An act to amend the act of Congress approved March 4, 1915 (38 Stat. 1214), as amended;

H. R. 1806. An act to amend further the Federal Register Act, as amended;

H. R. 1963. An act for the relief of Annelese Schillings;

H. R. 2564. An act to make the provisions of section 1362 of title 18 of the United States Code, relating to injury to or interference with communications systems operated or controlled by the United States, applicable to and within the Canal Zone;

H. R. 3884. An act to extend the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to establish and continue offices in the Republic of the Philippines;

H. R. 4167. An act to create a commission to be known as the Corregidor Bataan Memorial Commission;

H. R. 4663. An act making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4828. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5303. An act to amend sections 1606 and 1607 of the Internal Revenue Code in order to permit unemployment insurance coverage under State unemployment compensation laws for seamen employed on certain vessels operated by the United States;

H. R. 5349. An act authorizing the United States Government to reconvey certain lands to W. C. Pallmayer and E. M. Cole;

H. R. 5636. An act to amend veterans regulations to establish for persons who served in the Armed Forces during World War II a further presumption of service connection for tuberculosis other than pulmonary;

H. R. 6571. An act amending the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for the appointment of persons to exercise temporarily the duties of certain offices of the House of Representatives; and

H. J. Res. 293. Joint resolution to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Washington

State Third International Trade Fair, Seattle, Wash., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes.

ISSUANCE OF SPECIAL QUOTA IMMIGRANT VISAS TO CERTAIN ALIENS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. IVES (for himself, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. HENDRICKSON, and Mr. MORSE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 1917) to authorize the issuance of 240,000 special quota immigrant visas to certain escapees, German expellees, and nationals of Italy, Greece, and the Netherlands, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. LEHMAN submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to Senate bill 1917, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 6382) to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to extend until June 30, 1954, the period during which the General Services Administration may conduct negotiated sales of surplus property, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

HOUSE BILL PLACED ON CALENDAR

The bill (H. R. 6185) to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 with respect to preference accorded in Federal employment to disabled veterans, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and placed on the calendar.

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1949, RELATING TO EXTENSION OF PERIOD DURING WHICH AGRICULTURAL WORKERS MAY BE MADE AVAILABLE FOR EMPLOYMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLEMENTS in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3480) to amend section 509 of title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, to extend for 3 years the period during which agricultural workers may be made available for employment under such title, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. ELLENDER. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. AIKEN, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. THYE, Mr. ELLENDER, and Mr. HOEY conferees on the part of the Senate.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska, as in executive session, from the Committee on

Interior and Insular Affairs, to which was recommended the nomination of Glenn L. Emmons, of New Mexico, to be Commissioner of Indian Affairs, reported it favorably, and it was ordered to be placed on the Executive Calendar.

ADDITIONAL ARTICLE PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

By Mr. THYE:

Article entitled "MONRONEY Looks to the Future," written by Doris Fleeson, and published in the Washington Evening Star of July 28, 1953.

RECESS

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 10 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 29, 1953, at 10 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 28 (legislative day of July 27), 1953:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Charles Sparks Thomas, of California, to be Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Donald Aubrey Quarles, of New Jersey, to be Assistant Secretary of Defense.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON

Glen E. Edgerton, of the District of Columbia, to be Managing Director of the Export-Import Bank of Washington.

Lynn U. Stambaugh, of North Dakota, to be Deputy Director of the Export-Import Bank of Washington.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Seaborn Lee Digby, of Louisiana, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission, for the term of 5 years, expiring June 22, 1958, vice Harrington Wimberly, term expired.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

Kenneth H. Tuggle, of Kentucky, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner, for the remainder of the term expiring December 31, 1954, vice Walter M. W. Splawn, retired.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Phillip Ray Rodgers, of Maryland, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board, for the term of 5 years, expiring August 27, 1958.

CIRCUIT COURTS, TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Albert M. Felix, of Hawaii, to be third judge of the first circuit, Circuit Courts, Territory of Hawaii, vice John E. Parks, term expired.

Harry R. Hewitt, of Hawaii, to be fifth judge of the first circuit, Circuit Courts, Territory of Hawaii, vice Jon Wlig, elevated.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Frank M. Johnson, Jr., of Alabama, to be United States attorney for the northern district of Alabama, vice John D. Hill, resigning.

George Templar, of Kansas, to be United States attorney for the district of Kansas, vice Lester Luther, removed.

Peter Mills, of Maine, to be United States attorney for the district of Maine, vice Alton A. Lessard, resigned.

Charles P. Moriarty, of Washington, to be United States attorney for the western district of Washington, vice J. Charles Dennis, retired.

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued August 3, 1953
For actions of July 31 & Aug. 1, 1953
83rd-1st, Nos. 145 and 146

CONTENTS

Appropriations.....	Foreign trade.....	84	Reorganization..	4,18,20,82
.....12,14,37,38,49, 58	Forestry..	17,34,42,64,69,83	Research.....	51
Commodity exchanges...9,48	Fruit.....	89	Safety.....	8,22
Corn quotas.....11,14,52	Immigration.....	3,23	Social security.....	36
Cotton allotments.....5	Labor, farm.....	7,28,55	Soil cons. .	13,65,70,74,80
Crop insurance.....24	Loans, farm.....	4,20,29,34,54,61,67	Storage facilities.....	40
Debt limit..1,19,31,68,79, 92	Meat packing.....	71	Surpluses.....	63,66,86
Economic Advisers.....73	Nomination.....	30	Taxation.....	50
Education.....35,57	Payrolling.....	50	Tobacco.....	93
Electricity...45,60,77, 90	Penalty mail.....	33	Trade agreements.....	53
Expenditures.....75	Personnel.....	6,44,81	Training, farm.....	88
Farm machinery.....76	Potato supports.....	10,47	Treaty powers.....	43,85
Farm program.....39,45	Price supports....	10,47,67	Water.....	60,62,80,90
Foundations study.....56	Property, surplus.....	32	Weather control.....	15,26
Foreign aid.....	Reclamation....	16,17,25,27	Wheat agreement.....	91
.....2,12,18,21,30,78				

HIGHLIGHTS: Congressional action was completed on bills to reorganize FCA, provide famine relief, permit refugee immigration, expand crop insurance, study weather control, modify reclamation units, require penalty-mail payments, authorize forest loans, transfer cotton field station, extend fur-farmer loans, extend Mexican farm-labor program. House adopted conference reports on supplemental appropriations, foreign-aid appropriations, trade agreements. House passed bills to increase debt limit and modify corn and cotton quotas. Senate passed farm-tenant interest bill. Congress received President's messages on conservation and social security. Senate received Benson letter asking farm-program recommendations. House committee reported onion-marketing and potato-support bills. Bills were introduced on grazing procedures, soil-water conservation, and surplus disposal.

HOUSE - July 31

1. **DEBT LIMIT.** Passed, 239-158, without amendment H. R. 6672, increasing the U. S. statutory debt limit from \$275 billion to \$290 billion (pp. 10964-87, 11009).
2. **FAMINE RELIEF.** Agreed, 143-15, to the conference report on S. 2249, to enable the President, during the period ending Mar. 15, 1954, to furnish to peoples friendly to the U. S. emergency assistance in meeting famine or other urgent relief requirements. The overall limitation of \$100,000,000 remains, but the limit of \$20,000,000 for any one country was eliminated. Language was inserted to make it clear that the authority of CCC to deliver commodities under the bill is limited to the delivery of such commodities aboard vessels in U. S. ports. Therefore, all costs incurred in making delivery of the commodities after they have been placed on board will have to be paid either by the recipient countries or from ISA or other funds, and the \$100,000,000 limit will apply only to CCC investment and costs. Because of this action the conferees eliminated the provision that at least half of the shipments be made on U. S.-flag ships, since ISA already follows this policy. (pp. 10992-3).

1. IMMIGRATION. Agreed, 190-44, to the conference report on H. R. 6481, to admit into the U. S. for permanent residence up to 214,000 refugees, orphans, and certain close relatives of U. S. citizens and aliens admitted for permanent residence (pp. 10988-991).
4. FCA REORGANIZATION. Agreed to the conference report on H. R. 4353, to reorganize the Farm Credit Administration, etc. (pp. 10991-2). For provisions of report, see Digest 144.
5. COTTON ALLOTMENTS. Passed without amendment H. R. 6665, which provides that the national cotton acreage allotment for 1954 will be 22,500,000 acres (basic), that no State will receive an acreage cut of more than 29.5% below its 1952 acreage (the acreage for this is to be in addition to the national allotment), that State acreage reserves shall be used in addition to other purposes for correcting inequities in farm allotments, that with the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture county committees may apportion farm acreage allotments on the basis of previous farm history, and that for 1954 and 1955 any part of the acreage allotted to any farm which is voluntarily surrendered by the operator of that farm may be reallocated to other farms in the county (pp. 10932-40). The bill had been reported without amendment by the Agriculture Committee earlier in the day (H. Rept. 1058)(p. 11009).
6. PERSONNEL. Agreed to a Senate amendment to H. R. 6185, to require that veterans attain a passing grade before becoming eligible for civil-service appointments (pp. 10963-4). This bill will now be sent to the President.
7. FARM LABOR. Received the conference report on H. R. 3480, to extend the Mexican farm-labor program. The conferees agreed on an extension for 2 years instead of the House period of 3 years and the Senate period of 1 year. (p. 10993.)
8. SAFETY. Received the conference report on S. 1105, to incorporate the National Safety Council (pp. 10993-5).
9. COMMODITY EXCHANGES. The Agriculture Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 6435, to extend the Commodity Exchange Act to onions (p. D823).
10. POTATO SUPPORTS. The Agriculture Committee ordered reported (but did not actually report) H. R. 3895, to remove the prohibition against price supports on Irish potatoes (p. D823).
11. CORN QUOTAS. The Agriculture Committee ordered reported (but did not actually report) H. J. Res. 321, to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act with respect to the date of the proclamation of corn marketing quotas. The "Daily Digest" states: "Under the present law the Secretary of Agriculture must determine whether or not such quotas are necessary and make his proclamation not later than November 15 of the year prior to that in which quotas are to be invoked. This measure will postpone the 1954 proclamation until February 1, 1954, and is designed to give Congress an opportunity to reexamine the quota law before the Secretary is required to make his determination." (p. D823.)
12. FOREIGN-AID APPROPRIATION BILL, 1954. Agreed, 237-156, to the conference report on this bill, H. R. 6391, and acted on amendments in disagreement (pp. 10920-8). For provisions of the report see Digest 144.
13. CONSERVATION. Received from the President a message favoring additional conservation and development of land and water resources, etc. (H. Doc. 221)(pp. 90923-9).

28. FARM LABOR. Agreed to the conference report on H. R. 3480, to continue the Mexican farm-labor program for two years (p. 11090).
29. FARM LOANS. Passed as reported S. 1276, to increase the interest rate on farm-tenant loans (pp. 11097, 11104-5).
30. NOMINATION OF Harold E. Stassen, to be Director of Foreign Operations Administration, was confirmed (p. 11136).
31. DEBT LIMIT. The Finance Committee voted to defer further action until the next session of Congress on H. R. 6672, to increase the statutory debt limit (p. D830).
32. SURPLUS PROPERTY. Passed without amendment H. R. 6382, to extend until June 30, 1954, the period during which GSA may conduct negotiated sales of surplus property (p. 11054). This bill will now be sent to the President.
33. PENALTY MAIL. Passed without amendment H. R. 6281, to require executive departments, etc., to reimburse the Post Office Department for penalty mail (pp. 11078-9). This bill will now be sent to the President.
34. FOREST LOANS. Passed without amendment H. R. 5603, to authorize national banking associations to make loans on forest tracts (pp. 11070-2). This bill will now be sent to the President.
35. EDUCATION. Passed with amendments H. R. 6078 and 6079, to assist school districts in federally affected areas, and Senate conferees were appointed (pp. 11054-66).
36. SOCIAL SECURITY. Both Houses received the President's message recommending inclusion of additional groups, including farmers, in the Social Security Act (H. Doc. 225); to Senate Finance Committee and House Ways and Means Committee (pp. 11213, 11134).
37. STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1954. Sen. McCarthy was appointed as an additional conferee on this bill, H. R. 4974 (p. 11035).
38. SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1954. Rejected the conference report on this bill, H. R. 6200. Senate conferees were appointed for a further conference. (pp. 11097-104)
39. FARM PROGRAM. Sen. Aiken inserted a letter from Secretary Benson reviewing the studies now under way and stating, "The objective of our study is to have ready for Congress, when it reconvenes, judgments and recommendations that will be helpful in improving farm legislation." (pp. 11036-7.)
40. STORAGE FACILITIES. Sen. Murray asked additional USDA action to make available more wheat-storage facilities (pp. 11037-40).
41. TRANSPORTATION. Sen. Griswold inserted a Farm Bureau letter favoring H. R. 3203, the trip-leasing bill (pp. 11049-50).
42. FORESTRY. Passed without amendment H. R. 3956, to provide for conveyance of a tract in the Santa Fe National Forest, N. Mex. (p. 11052). This bill will now be sent to the President.
43. TREATY POWERS. Sen. Bricker spoke in support of his resolution to limit treaty powers and criticized the Knowland substitute (pp. 11090-7).

14. SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1954. Received the conference report on this bill, H. R. 6200 (pp. 11005-7). The conferees fixed the corn acreage allotment item at \$5,000,000 and reported in disagreement the provision continuing drought-relief funds of Public Law 371, 82nd Cong.

15. WEATHER CONTROL. Passed as reported S. 285, to establish an Advisory Committee on Weather Control to study and evaluate public and private experiments in weather control for the purpose of determining the extent to which the U. S. should experiment with, engage in, or regulate weather control (pp. 10930-2).

16. RECLAMATION. Passed with amendments H. R. 5731, to authorize the Santa Margarita River project, Calif. (pp. 10940-1).

17. GRAZING LANDS. Rep. D'Ewart spoke in support of the stockmen's grazing bill and said Rep. Hope was introducing a modified bill on this subject which has the support of various interested parties (p. 10930).

17. RECLAMATION. Rep. D'Ewart recommended the establishment of various additional reclamation projects (p. 10930).

SENATE - July 31

18. FOREIGN AID; REORGANIZATION. Sen. Mansfield criticized the President's reorganization plan establishing a Foreign Operations Administration (pp. 10899-901).

19. DEBT LIMIT. Discussed the President's request for an increase in the debt limit (pp. 10903-8).

SENATE - August 1

20. FCA REORGANIZATION. Agreed to the conference report on H. R. 4353, to reorganize the Farm Credit Administration, etc. (p. 11040). This bill will now be sent to the President.

21. FAMINE RELIEF. Agreed to the conference report on S. 2249, the famine-relief bill (p. 11044). This bill will now be sent to the President.

22. SAFETY. Agreed to the conference report on S. 1105, to incorporate the National Safety Council (p. 11049). This bill will now be sent to the President.

23. IMMIGRATION. Agreed to the conference report on H. R. 6431, to authorize immigration of 214,000 refugees, etc. (pp. 11073-7). This bill will now be sent to the President.

24. CROP INSURANCE. Concurred in the House amendments to S. 1367, to continue the authority for expansion of the crop insurance program to additional counties (p. 11044). This bill will now be sent to the President.

25. RECLAMATION. Concurred in the House amendments to S. 2097, to increase the amount authorized for the Eklutna, Alaska, project (pp. 11048-9). This bill will now be sent to the President.

26. WEATHER CONTROL. Concurred in the House amendments to S. 285, to authorize a study of weather-control activities, etc. (p. 11048). This bill will now be sent to the President.

27. RECLAMATION. Concurred in the House amendments to S. 287, to permit the exchange and amendment of farm units on Federal irrigation projects (pp. 11049, 11083-4). This bill will now be sent to the President.

lines for the shipment of its commodities, it is assumed that they will continue to use that policy and, therefore, it is not necessary that that provision remain in the bill.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Do I understand then from the gentleman from Kansas that the report calls attention to the fact that it has heretofore been the policy that 50 percent of cargoes be carried in American flag vessels?

Mr. HOPE. Yes, I will be glad to read that provision in the report.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. That is not necessary as long as I have the gentleman's assurance to that effect.

Mr. HOPE. It is the next to the last paragraph of the report. I think it states the matter clearly enough, and there is no reason to believe that the usual practice in that regard will not be followed.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. What provision, if any, was made for the payment of transportation or transfer of the Commodity Credit Corporation stock?

Mr. HOPE. Under the provisions of the House bill, which language was stricken out on a point of order made by the gentleman from Missouri, there was no provision by which the Commodity Credit Corporation could use its funds for the purpose of paying transportation charges. Of course, that language could not be reinserted in the conference because it would again be subject to a point of order when the conference report was submitted to the House. However, the conferees did adopt a provision in the first section of the bill which provides that the commodities shall be made available to the President f. o. b. vessels in United States ports. This means that the Commodity Credit Corporation would pay the transportation charges to shipboard and the unloading charges, which they can do without any additional appropriation, because they have the funds already which can be used for that purpose.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Will the gentleman answer another question? Would that not be using funds for a purpose for which they were not appropriated?

Mr. HOPE. No.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. It would be a circumvention of the language which was struck out in the bill?

Mr. HOPE. No. Under other provisions of law, the Commodity Credit Corporation has authority to pay charges on shipments going out of this country to shipboard.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COOLEY. I would like to suggest that the reason for the action taken by the conferees is the fact that the bill itself authorized the Commodity Credit Corporation to make deliveries, but it did not fix the place of delivery. So in changing the language in the bill, we

only fixed the place of delivery and fixed that as f. o. b. vessels in American ports.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield me half a minute to make a statement?

Mr. HOPE. I yield the gentleman half a minute.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. There was a misunderstanding at the time the gentleman from Missouri made his point of order to the language in the bill. My purpose there was not to try to cut down the stocks that would be available, but rather to increase them. And that would have been done had this language been carried in the bill, and if funds for the transfer and transportation had been made available by the Mutual Security Administration which does have funds that they could have made available, more food would have been available than they have under the language that the conferees have brought back in this bill.

I am not going to try to delay the passage of the bill, but I still maintain that my position at that time was sound and it would have been sound if that language had been maintained in this bill.

Mr. HOPE. That is still the effect of the gentleman's amendment. It still prevents the Commodity Credit Corporation from paying all of the ocean freight and other transportation charges except to shipboard.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. The MSA, or the recipient country, or the President from some other fund which is now available to him, would have to pay the freight on all the shipments that are to be made beyond the point of American ports.

Mr. HOPE. That is correct.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. Briefly, I yield.

Mr. FULTON. As the gentleman will recall, I had an amendment to strike out the \$20 million limitation per country.

Mr. HOPE. I will say to the gentleman that that is out.

Mr. FULTON. That is out, and there is no limitation on zones or countries?

Mr. HOPE. There is no limitation on countries.

Mr. FULTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken; and (on a division demanded by Mr. DAVIS of Georgia) there were—ayes 143, noes 15.

So the conference report was agreed to; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING SECTION 509 OF TITLE V OF THE AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1949

Mr. HOPE submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 3480) to amend section 509 of title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949,

to extend for 3 years the period during which agricultural workers may be made available for employment under such title:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1071)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3480) to amend section 509 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, to extend for 3 years the period during which agricultural workers may be made available for employment under such title, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "1955."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the bill, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the amended title proposed by the Senate, amend the title so as to read: "An act to amend section 509 of title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, to extend for 2 years the period during which agricultural workers may be made available for employment under such title."

And the Senate agree to the same.

CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
AUGUST H. ANDRESEN,
WILLIAM S. HILL,
HAROLD D. COOLEY,
W. R. POAGE,

Managers on the Part of the House.

GEORGE D. AIKEN,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
EDWARD J. THYE,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
CLYDE R. HOEY,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3480) to amend section 509 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, to extend for 3 years the period during which agricultural workers may be made available for employment under such title, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House bill extended the law for 3 years. The Senate amendment extended the law for only 1 year. The agreement reached by the committee of conference will extend the law for 2 years.

CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
AUGUST H. ANDRESEN,
WILLIAM S. HILL,
HAROLD D. COOLEY,
W. R. POAGE,

Managers on the Part of the House.

NATIONAL SAFETY COUNCIL

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (S. 1105) to incorporate the National Safety Council:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1072)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1105) to incorporate the National Safety Council, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do

recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"That Melvin H. Baker, Lawrence D. Bell, James B. Black, S. Bruce Black, Morgan B. Bralnard, John W. Carpenter, Ray Carr, William G. Chandler, Kenneth B. Coiman, Frederick C. Crawford, Walter J. Cummings, Richard R. Deupree, Benjamin F. Fairless, Wallace Falvey, Francis J. Gavin, George A. Jacoby, George E. Leighty, Horace P. Liveridge, Henry E. North, Thomas I. Parkinson, A. V. Rohweder, William A. Simpson, Lee E. Skeel, W. A. Stewart, John Stilwell, J. E. Trainer, and Juan T. Trippe are hereby created and declared to be a body corporate by the name of National Safety Council (hereinafter called the corporation) and by such name shall be known and have perpetual succession and the powers and limitations contained in this Act.

"COMPLETION OF ORGANIZATION

"SEC. 2. The persons named in the first section of this Act are authorized to complete the organization of the corporation by the selection of officers and employees, the adoption of a constitution and bylaws, not inconsistent with this Act, and the doing of such other acts as may be necessary for such purpose.

"OBJECTS AND PURPOSES OF CORPORATION

"SEC. 3. The objects and purposes of the corporation shall be—

"(1) to further, encourage, and promote methods and procedures leading to increased safety, protection, and health among employees and employers and among children, in industries, on farms, in schools and colleges, in homes, on streets and highways, in recreation, and in other public and private places;

"(2) to collect, correlate, publish, distribute, and disseminate educational and informative data, reports, and all other data relative to safety methods and procedures;

"(3) to arouse and maintain the interest of the people of the United States, its Territories and possessions in safety and in accident prevention, and to encourage the adoption and institution of safety methods by all persons, corporations, and other organizations;

"(4) to organize, establish, and conduct programs, lectures, conferences, and other activities for the education of all persons, corporations, and other organizations in safety methods and procedures;

"(5) to organize, and to aid in the organization of, local safety chapters throughout the United States, its Territories and possessions, and to provide organizational guidance and materials to promote the national safety;

"(6) to cooperate with, enlist, and develop the cooperation of and between all persons, corporations, and other organizations and agencies, both public and private, engaged or interested in, or in any manner connected with, any or all of the foregoing purposes; and

"(7) to do any and all lawful acts which may be necessary, useful, suitable, desirable, and proper for the furtherance, accomplishment, and attainment of any or all of the foregoing purposes.

"CORPORATE POWERS

"SEC. 4. The corporation shall have power—

"(1) to sue and be sued, complain, and defend in any court of competent jurisdiction;

"(2) to adopt, alter, and use a corporate seal;

"(3) to choose such officers, directors, trustees, managers, agents, and employees as the business of the corporation may require;

"(4) to adopt, amend, and alter a constitution and bylaws, not inconsistent with the laws of the United States or any State in which the corporation is to operate, for the management of its property and the regulation of its affairs;

"(5) to contract and be contracted with;

"(6) to charge and collect membership dues, subscription fees, and receive contributions or grants of money or property to be devoted to the carrying out of its purposes;

"(7) to take and hold by lease, gift, purchase, grant, devise, or bequest any property, real or personal, necessary for attaining the objects and carrying into effect the purposes of the corporation, subject to applicable provisions of law in any State (a) governing the amount or kind of real and personal property which may be held by, or (b) otherwise limiting or controlling the ownership of real or personal property by a corporation operating in such State;

"(8) to transfer, encumber, and convey real or personal property;

"(9) to borrow money for the purposes of the corporation, issue bonds therefor, and secure the same by mortgage, subject to all applicable provisions of Federal or State law;

"(10) to use the corporate funds to give prizes, awards, or other evidences of merit or recognition to persons, organizations, associations, or corporations, public or private, for outstanding contributions toward the achievement of the purposes of the corporation;

"(11) to publish magazines and other publications and materials, whether periodic or occasional, consistent with its corporate purposes;

"(12) to organize, establish, and conduct conferences on safety and accident prevention;

"(13) to adopt, alter, use, and display such emblems, seals, and badges as it may adopt;

"(14) to establish and maintain offices for the conduct of its business, and to charter local, State, and regional safety organizations, and to establish, regulate, and discontinue departmental subdivisions and local, State, and regional chapters in appropriate places throughout the United States, its Territories and possessions; and

"(15) to do any and all acts and things necessary and proper to carry out the objects and purposes of the corporation and, for such purpose, the corporation shall also have, in addition to the foregoing in this section and subsection, the rights, powers, duties, and liabilities of the existing corporation referred to in section 18 as far as they are not modified or superseded by this Act.

"PRINCIPAL OFFICE; SCOPE OF ACTIVITIES; DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AGENT

"SEC. 5. (a) The principal office of the corporation shall be located in Chicago, Illinois, or in such other place as may later be determined by the board of directors, but the activities of the corporation shall not be confined to that place and may be conducted throughout the various States, Territories, and possessions of the United States.

"(b) The corporation shall maintain at all times in the District of Columbia a designated agent authorized to accept service or process for the corporation, and notice to or service upon such agent, or mailed to the business address of such agent, shall be deemed notice to or service upon the corporation.

"MEMBERSHIP; VOTING RIGHTS

"SEC. 6. (a) Eligibility for membership in the corporation and the rights and privileges of members shall, except as provided in this Act, be determined as the constitution and bylaws of the corporation may provide,

"(b) Each member of the corporation, other than honorary and sustaining members, shall have the right to one vote on each matter submitted to a vote at all meetings of the members of the corporation. The corporation may, by its constitution and bylaws, provide for additional voting rights in accordance with dues paid.

"BOARD OF DIRECTORS; COMPOSITION; RESPONSIBILITIES

"SEC. 7. Upon enactment of this Act the membership of the initial board of directors of the corporation shall consist of the present members of the board of directors of the National Safety Council, Inc., referred to in section 18 of this Act, or such of them as may then be living and are qualified directors of that corporation, to wit—E. F. du Pont, Wilmington, Delaware; Franklin M. Kreml, Evanston, Illinois; A. F. Allen, Dallas, Texas; J. I. Banash, West Los Angeles, California; William B. Barton, Washington, District of Columbia; C. W. Bergquist, Indianapolis, Indiana; R. A. L. Bogan, Chicago, Illinois; Norman E. Borgerson, Lansing, Michigan; Harry H. Brainerd, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; Fred W. Braun, Wausau, Wisconsin; Theo Brown, Moline, Illinois; E. J. Buhner, Louisville, Kentucky; Alfred W. Cantwell, Washington, District of Columbia; Ray Carr, Portland, Oregon; Jesse Clark, Chicago, Illinois; Reginald M. Cleveland, New York, New York; William L. Connolly, Washington, District of Columbia; Doctor B. L. Corbett, Milwaukee, Wisconsin; Charles R. Cos, New York, New York; Ernest G. Cox, Washington, District of Columbia; R. S. Damon, Kansas City, Missouri; Ned H. Dearborn, Chicago, Illinois; J. Dewey Dorsett, New York, New York; E. F. du Pont, Wilmington, Delaware; Martin P. Durkin, Washington, District of Columbia; Wallace Falvey, Boston, Massachusetts; Kirk Fox, Des Moines, Iowa; C. H. Galloway, Southbridge, Massachusetts; George F. Getz, Junior, Chicago, Illinois; Gordon C. Graham, Detroit, Michigan; Howard Gramlich, Chicago, Illinois; W. Earl Hall, Mason City, Iowa; R. A. Harschnek, Chicago, Illinois; O. R. Hartwig, Portland, Oregon; Doctor Herold C. Hunt, Chicago, Illinois; Harold P. Jackson, Newark, New Jersey; George A. Jacoby, Detroit, Michigan; Mrs. George W. Jaqua, Winchester, Indiana; Joseph M. Kaplan, Los Angeles, California; E. W. Kempton, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; Mrs. Fred W. Knight, Cartersville, Georgia; Franklin M. Kreml, Evanston, Illinois; Walter G. Legge, New York, New York; Boyd Lewis, New York, New York; Thomas H. MacDonald, College Station, Texas; Miss Marion E. Martin, Augusta, Maine; I. W. Millard, Danville, Illinois; Harry M. Moses, Washington, District of Columbia; D. E. Mumford, New York, New York; Hallie L. Myers, Indianapolis, Indiana; Guy L. Noble, Chicago, Illinois; Henry E. North, San Francisco, California; Clifton W. Phalen, Detroit, Michigan; Harry L. Powell, Milwaukee, Wisconsin; Harry Read, Washington, District of Columbia; A. V. Rohweder, Duluth, Minnesota; Robert T. Ross, Dearborn, Michigan; Doctor K. Frances Scott, Northampton, Massachusetts; Honorable Lee E. Skeel, Cleveland, Ohio; Robert R. Snodgrass, Atlanta, Georgia; Leslie J. Sorenson, Chicago, Illinois; Doctor H. J. Stack, New York, New York; J. C. Stennett, Chicago, Illinois; W. A. Stewart, Southbridge, Massachusetts; Miss Judith Waller, Chicago, Illinois; Mrs. George Welles, Junior, Duluth, Minnesota; Doctor George M. Wheatley, New York, New York; E. C. Woodward, Milwaukee, Wisconsin; and Doctor William P. Yant, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

"(b) Thereafter, the board of directors of the corporation shall consist of such number (not less than fifteen), shall be selected in such manner (including the filling of vacancies), and shall serve for such term as may be prescribed in the constitution and bylaws of the corporation.

7/31/81

44. PERSONNEL. Sen. Watkins said the present Administration has protected the civil service, and he inserted a list of laws passed 1933-1952 which authorized employment without regard to the civil service and classification laws (pp. 11107-8).
45. FARM PROGRAM; ELECTRIFICATION. Sen. Morse inserted various statements regarding the farm program and spoke on additional electrification proposals (pp. 11118-33).
46. RECESSED until Mon., Aug. 3 (p. 11134).

HOUSE - August 1

47. POTATO SUPPORTS. The Agriculture Committee reported without amendment H. R. 3895, to permit Irish potato price supports (H. Rept. 1080)(p. 11221).
48. COMMODITY EXCHANGES. The Agriculture Committee reported without amendment H. R. 6435, to extend the Commodity Exchange Act to onions (H. Rept. 1082)(p. 11221).
49. STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1954. House conferees were appointed on this bill, H. R. 4974 (p. 11160).
50. TAXATION; PAYROLLING. Recommitted H. R. 6413, to permit the withholding by the Federal Government from wages of employees certain taxes imposed by municipalities (pp. 11162-75).
51. LAND TRANSFER. Passed without amendment S. 2163, to transfer a BPISAE cotton-research field station to N. C. (p. 11181). This bill will now be sent to the President.
52. CORN MARKETING QUOTAS. Passed without amendment H. J. Res. 321, to postpone the proclamation of 1954 corn quotas until Feb. 1, 1954 (pp. 11181-3).
and agreed to (pp. 11205-7)
53. TRADE AGREEMENTS. Received the conference report on H. R. 5495, to extend the authority for reciprocal trade agreements (p. 11221). The "Daily Digest" states, "Results of the conference are as follows:
"(1) The House receded in its disagreement to the Senate amendment providing that the enactment of H. R. 5495 expresses neither approval nor disapproval of General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.
"(2) The House receded, with a clerical change, in its disagreement to the Senate provision amending section 22 (b) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act which provides for emergency action by the President without awaiting the recommendations of the Tariff Commission.
"(3) The conferees agreed to keep the membership of the Tariff Commission at six; and also agreed that in votes as to whether investigations or hearings shall be held resulting in a tie, such proceedings shall occur.
"(4) The House receded with an amendment in its disagreement to the Senate provision that a quorum of the Commission on Foreign Economic Policy shall consist of 9 members, of whom at least 5 shall be Members of Congress." The conferees also acted on other provisions regarding membership and scope of the Commission. (p. D633.)
54. FARM LOANS. Passed without amendment S. 1152, to authorize USDA to make supplemental loans to fur farmers for 5 additional years (p. 11192). This bill will now be sent to the President.
55. FARM LABOR. Agreed to the conference report on H. R. 3480, to continue the Mexican farm-labor program for 2 additional years (p. 11184). This bill will

now be sent to the President.

56. FOUNDATIONS INVESTIGATION. Agreed to, with amendment, H. Res. 373, to provide funds for an investigation of tax-exempt foundations (pp. 11180-1). Also H. Res. 365.
57. EDUCATION. House conferees were appointed on H. R. 6049 and 6078, to aid school districts in federally affected areas (pp. 11175-6).
58. SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1954. Agreed to the first conference report on this bill, H. R. 6200 (pp. 11150-9). Received the second conference report on the bill (pp. 11218-20). The \$5,000,000 figure for USDA is retained in the revised conference report.
59. ADJOURNED until Mon., Aug. 3 (p. 11221).

BILLS INTRODUCED

60. WATER; ELECTRIFICATION. H. R. 6708, by Rep. D'Ewart, to require the use of certain reporting procedures by certain Federal agencies which are concerned with water and power development projects; to Public Works Committee (p. 11010).
61. FARM LOANS. H. R. 6711, by Rep. Hope, to further amend section 13 of the Federal Farm Loan Act to authorize the Federal land banks to make a bulk purchase of certain remaining assets of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation; to Agriculture Committee (p. 11010). Also S. 2552, by Sen. Schoeppel (p. 11016).
62. WATER CONSERVATION. H. R. 6718, by Del. Farrington, to extend certain water and conservation laws to Hawaii; to Interior and Insular Affairs Committee (p. 11010).
63. SURPLUS COMMODITIES. H. Res. 376, by Rep. Matthews, requesting the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to investigate the feasibility of distributing surplus agricultural commodities to needy individuals; to Agriculture Committee. (p. 11010.)
64. FORESTRY. S. 2548, by Sen. Aiken (for himself and Sen. Thye), to facilitate the administration of the national forests and other lands under jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture; to provide for the orderly use, improvement and development thereof; to stabilize the livestock industry dependent thereon, etc.; to Agriculture and Forestry Committee. Remarks of author. (pp. 11016-19.)
65. SOIL CONSERVATION. S. 2549, by Sen. Aiken (for himself and others), to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with States and local agencies in the planning and carrying out the works of improvement for soil conservation, etc.; to Agriculture and Forestry Committee. (pp. 11016, 11019-20.)
66. SURPLUS COMMODITIES. S. 2550 by Sen. Aiken (for himself and Sen. Humphrey), to provide for distribution of surplus commodities through a food allotment program; to Agriculture and Forestry Committee. Remarks of author. (pp. 11016, 11020-3.)
67. LIVESTOCK LOANS. S. 2554, by Sen. Murray (for himself and Sen. Humphrey), to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to make loans to livestock producers; to Agriculture and Forestry Committee. Remarks of author. (pp. 11016, 11023.)
68. DEBT LIMIT. S. 2577, by Sen. Douglas, to increase the public debt limit by

any individual member of the committee what the committee as a whole was apt to do. But not once did Mr. Rodgers succumb to the temptation to appear on a radio or television with startling pronouncements. Nor has he ever written great "exposés" for the press or periodicals. Nor has he used his "inside knowledge" for overt political partisanship.

Ray Rodgers served the men with whom he worked, he served the Senate of the United States—and he served both well. He never used those men or this Senate to serve himself.

My Republican colleagues know what a rock-ribbed Republican Ray Rodgers was and is. I do not understand how his long exposure to our advanced thinking failed to convert him to our way of thinking. Nonetheless, I want the record to show that despite his Republicanism, Mr. Rodgers knew well—as did his friend Bob Taft—the vital importance in politics of integrity, of keeping one's word, and of treating members of the opposition as though they too were decent, human, loyal Americans.

I know from the basic differences in our philosophies that I shall probably differ with particular conclusions which Mr. Rodgers will probably arrive at as a Member of the NLRB. But I also know that just as in the case of my differences with Bob Taft those differences will arise, if they do, out of thoughtfully determined, honestly held, sincere divergences of opinion.

I congratulate Mr. Rodgers on his appointment. Still more do I congratulate the Administration on giving us a nominee who is not only a Republican but one thoroughly well qualified, well-trained, experienced, and fair-minded. I hope that in seeking his replacement, the distinguished chairman of the committee, Senator Smith will be fortunate enough to find one who will be as loyal to the Republicans he serves and who will evince that same sense of balance in his relations with the men on the Democratic side of the table as has Mr. Rodgers.

RIO GRANDE BRIDGE, TEXAS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, from the Committee on Foreign Relations I report favorably, without amendment, H. R. 1219, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). The clerk will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 1219) authorizing the Hidalgo Bridge Co., its heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a railroad toll bridge across the Rio Grande at or near Hidalgo, Tex.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill? It is not on the calendar.

Mr. WILEY. The bill authorizes the Hidalgo Bridge Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a railroad toll bridge across the Rio Grande at or near Hidalgo, Tex. It is practically identical with legislation passed in the 80th Congress, which has since expired.

Mr. LANGER. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 1219) authorizing the Hidalgo Bridge Co., its heirs, legal representa-

tives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a railroad toll bridge across the Rio Grande at or near Hidalgo, Tex., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ST. LAWRENCE RIVER BRIDGE, NEW YORK

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, from the Committee on Foreign Relations I report favorably, without amendment, House bill 307, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 307), to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act authorizing the Ogdensburg Bridge Authority, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the St. Lawrence River at or near the city of Ogdensburg, N. Y."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONFIRMATION OF NOMINATIONS TO FOREIGN OPERATIONS AD- MINISTRATION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the President has today renominated Harold E. Stassen, William McNear Rand, and Walter S. DeLany, to the Foreign Operations Administration. The nominees were thoroughly investigated some months ago, but because a new reorganization plan has gone into effect it is necessary that the nominees be reappointed. I ask unanimous consent, as in executive session, that the nominations be considered at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the nominations, as in executive session?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, in view of the fact that these officials have been previously confirmed after hearing, and because it is necessary to reconfirm them as the result of the going into effect of a reorganization act, I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the nominations.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Harold E. Stassen to be Director of the Foreign Operations Administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William McNear Rand to be Deputy Director of the Foreign Operations Administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the name of Walter S. DeLany to be Deputy Director of the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Without objection, the President will be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nominations.

THE EARMARKING OF FUNDS FROM THE FEDERALLY CONTROLLED OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF FOR EDUCATIONAL PURPOSES

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, the Hill amendment did not carry in House-Senate conference, despite the efforts of the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], but it is my judgment that the Congress will yet approve a so-called oil-for-education amendment.

The principle of earmarking funds from the federally controlled outer Continental Shelf for educational purposes is not dead, despite the loss of the Hill amendment.

I predict that a version of this legislation, but a different version than the one so ably championed by the Senator from Alabama, will be approved in the next session of the Congress. It is in this connection that I rise at this time.

Mr. President, I send to the desk for appropriate reference an amendment to the Outer Shelf legislation approved this week by the Senate and the House.

It is similar, except for technical changes, to the amendment which I offered on June 23 of this year, to Senate bill 1901, and in which I was joined as co-sponsor by the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]. I am happy to say that he joins me in this effort as well.

The junior Senator from New Jersey earlier this week was distressed by the unfortunate circumstances under which we were either forced to hold up the development of the resource-rich Outer Continental Shelf, or vote for its development by adopting the conference report without any aid for education proposal contained therein.

Now, Mr. President, the simple fact is that even if the Hill amendment had been approved under the conference report, no benefits would have accrued to the Nation's school children, because the Hill amendment simply does not go far enough if it is the earnest desire of this Senate to start the revenues from the outer shelf flowing into the school systems of our States and Territories.

It is no small wonder to me, although I deplore it, that the House conferees were adamant against accepting an aid-to-education proposal. The fact is that the House of Representatives has always been the graveyard of Federal aid-to-education legislation, and the Hill amendment merely throws the door wide open to the same old arguments that have successfully served to bog down such legislation over the years.

The fact is that the Hill amendment requires implementing legislation, and not one cent of the vast revenues which will be derived from the outer shelf would go to the school systems under its provisions, standing alone. As I said, it must be implemented.

Mr. President, the House conferees understood this as they stood fast against the amendment.

In recent weeks, when the Senate approved the Outer Shelf bill, with the Hill amendment incorporated, it rejected, by a narrow margin, the implementing Hendrickson-Case amendment. Our amendment fully protects the historic

and constitutional rights of the States over the control of their educational systems.

Under the Hendrickson-Case amendment, the funds derived from these Federal resources would go for the benefit of our educational systems, to be apportioned among the States on a proportional school population basis. It makes the Federal Government merely a clearing house. The States are to use the funds according to their own statutes.

In that manner, there would be no need for new legislation which would be likely to break down in the House, the traditional stumbling block in the way of Federal aid-to-education matters, just as the Hill amendment was rejected by the House conferees because it held out the specter of Federal "grants-in-aid" and all that term implies in the area of potential Federal control of the educational purse-strings and in the momentous question of aid to private schools.

The junior Senator from New Jersey supports the principles of the Hill amendment as it applies to the Outer Shelf, and gives all the credit in the world to the distinguished Senator from Alabama, for he has persistently sought to pledge these Federal funds for educational purposes and was the originator of the basic idea.

The Senator from Alabama and his colleagues deserve credit for their persevering efforts. But, Mr. President, because of the reluctance of the House conferees, they have lost their chance to aid the Nation's children, for the moment.

It is almost a certainty that even if the Hill amendment had carried through conference, it would have become ensnared in the old prejudices and problems surrounding Federal aid to education legislation.

Mr. President, the Senator from Alabama and his colleagues will now have a real opportunity to realize their goals. It is my belief that if the supporters of the Hill amendment really desire to do something about our educational problems, they will rally behind the only formula which can be agreed upon, in my judgment, and they will vote for the Hendrickson-Case amendment which they will have an opportunity to support in the next session of the 83d Congress.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield to me?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Will the distinguished Senator state the difference between the amendment submitted by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and the so-called Hendrickson-Case amendment?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. The Hendrickson-Case amendment merely apportions the money to the States according to the school populations of the States, whereas the Hill amendment would require future implementation and would undoubtedly give the Federal Government control of the purse strings, so that the National Government could conceivably control the activities of the States in their educational programs.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield further to me?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LANGER. Does the school population of a State include all the children of school age in the State, even if they do not go to school?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. It includes all the children attending school according to the Federal census.

Mr. LANGER. Is the Hendrickson-Case amendment to be based on the school population?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. How would the amendment apply to the States which have a number of children of school age who do not actually attend school?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Provided they are counted by the Census Bureau, they would be included.

Mr. LANGER. For instance, many children of the Navaho Indians have attended school so little that they are not able to speak English.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. It is my view that it would be a good thing to be able to include those Navaho Indians.

Mr. LANGER. Are there any other differences between the Hill amendment and the so-called Hendrickson-Case amendment? What is the situation in the case of the private schools?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. The private-school children would be included under our amendment in the enumeration of school population.

Mr. LANGER. How about the parochial schools?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Yes, they would be likewise enumerated and the benefits would be distributed as the law of each individual State provides.

Mr. LANGER. Would they be included under the Hill amendment?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I do not recall exactly; but I do know that the Hill amendment would have to be implemented by future legislation in relation to all such issues.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator. Mr. President, I hope the bill will be passed at this session.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I intend to press this issue from this moment, on.

Mr. LANGER. I hope the Senator from New Jersey will do so at this session.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I shall endeavor to do so.

I thank the Senator from North Dakota for his contribution.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 509 OF TITLE V OF AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1949—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3480) to amend section 509 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, to extend for 3 years the period during which agricultural workers may be made available for employment under such

title. I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The report was read by the legislative clerk.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of July 31, 1953, p. 10993, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the Senate voted to extend this act for 1 year. The House voted to extend it for 3 years. The conference report provides that it be extended for 2 years.

I move the adoption of the report.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield for a question?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Does the report contain any provision dealing with the old fight we had 2 years ago about the provision that in case Mexicans who illegally entered the United States were employed by United States farmers, the farmers who employed them would be subject to prosecution?

Mr. AIKEN. No; there is nothing of that sort in the conference report.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, let me inquire whether the conferees were unanimous on the report.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes, they were.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the report.

The report was agreed to.

THE ADMINISTRATION'S SUBSTITUTE FOR SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 1

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I wish to discuss for a few moments this afternoon a matter of vital importance to the Senate and to the country. I had intended, if there were too much pressure of legislative business, to ask that my statement on this subject be printed in the body of the RECORD. However, at the present time I think it is possible for this matter to be discussed fully.

On July 22, 1953, the acting majority leader introduced an amendment in the nature of a substitute for Senate Joint Resolution 1. Immediately thereafter, the President announced his "unqualified support" for the substitute proposal. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senate Joint Resolution 1, as reported by the Senate Judiciary Committee, and the proposed substitute be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the joint resolution and the amendment in the nature of a substitute were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution

(8) to borrow money for the purposes of the corporation, issue bonds therefor, and secure the same by mortgage, subject to all applicable provisions of Federal or State law;

(9) to use the corporate funds to give prizes, or awards, to citizens for outstanding contributions toward the achievement of the purposes of the corporation;

(10) to publish a magazine or other publication consistent with its corporate purposes.

(11) to use and display such emblems and badges as it may adopt; and

(12) to do any and all acts and things necessary and proper to carry out the objects and purposes of the corporation.

HEADQUARTERS AND PRINCIPAL OFFICES; STATES AND TERRITORIAL SCOPE OF ACTIVITIES; DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AGENT

SEC. 5. (a) The headquarters and principal offices of the corporation shall be located in the District of Columbia, or in the States of Maryland or Virginia, but the activities of the corporation shall not be confined to these places but may be conducted throughout the various States, Territories, and possessions of the United States.

(b) The corporation shall maintain at all times in the District of Columbia a designated agent authorized to accept service of process for the corporation, such designation to be filed in the office of the clerk of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia. Notice to or service upon such agent, or mailed to the business address of such agent, shall be deemed sufficient notice or service upon the corporation.

MEMBERSHIP; VOTING RIGHTS

SEC. 6. Membership in the corporation shall be confined to agencies and organizations and the rights and privileges of membership shall, except as otherwise provided in this act, be prescribed by the bylaws of the corporation. In the conduct of the business of the annual national conference on citizenship each agency or organization sending delegates to, and participating in such conferences shall have 1 vote.

NATIONAL OFFICERS; ELECTION OF OFFICERS

SEC. 7. (a) The national officers shall be a president, who shall serve as chairman of the board of directors and of the executive committee, a first vice president, a second vice president, a third vice president, a secretary, and a treasurer, to be selected from the officers and members of the member agencies or organizations participating in the conference.

(b) For the purposes of initiating the corporation, the national officers shall be elected within 10 days of the date of enactment of this act by the persons named in the first section of this act, to serve until the final session of the next following annual conference. Thereafter, the national officers of the corporation shall be elected biennially by a majority vote of the agencies and organizations sending delegates to, and participating in the annual conference, one vote to each such agency and to each such organization.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS; COMPOSITION; MEETINGS, EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE; EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

SEC. 8. (a) From the date of enactment of this act until the final session of the next following annual conference, the governing body of the corporation, which shall exercise the powers herein granted to the corporation, shall be the persons named in the first section of this act and such additional persons as shall be named by them. Thereafter, the governing body of the corporation shall be a board of directors consisting of such number (not less than 10 including ex officio members) as the bylaws may prescribe. The Board of Directors shall be selected from the officers or members of the

member agencies or organizations participating in the conference.

(b) The members of the board of directors shall be elected for such term as the bylaws shall prescribe by a majority vote of the agencies and organizations sending delegates to, and participating in the annual conference, one vote to each such agency and to each such organization.

(c) The board shall meet at least once each year at such time and place as may be prescribed by the bylaws. The annual report of the board shall be presented at such meeting. Special meetings of the board may be called as prescribed by the bylaws.

(d) The board shall designate 3 of its own members, who together with the president and the 3 vice presidents shall constitute the executive committee which, when the board is not in session, shall have and exercise the powers of the board subject to its direction and have the power to authorize the seal of the corporation to be affixed to all papers which may require it.

(e) An executive director for the corporation shall be selected by the executive committee in keeping with qualifications and terms of employment adopted by such committee. Other professional staff members shall be nominated by the executive director and approved by the executive committee.

USE OF INCOME OR ASSETS; LOANS TO OFFICERS, DIRECTORS OR EMPLOYEES

SEC. 9. (a) No part of the income or assets of the corporation shall inure to any member, officer, or director, or be distributable to any such person, agency, or organization except upon dissolution or final liquidation of the corporation as provided in section 15 of this act. Nothing in this subsection, however, shall be construed to prevent the executive committee from adopting terms of employment of the executive director as prescribed by section 8 (e) of this act.

(b) The corporation shall not make loans to its officers, directors, or employees. Any director who votes for or assents to the making of a loan to an officer, director, or employee of the corporation, and any officer who participates in the making of such loan shall be jointly and severally liable to the corporation for the amount of such loan until the repayment thereof.

NONPOLITICAL NATURE OF CORPORATION

SEC. 10. The corporation, and its members, officers, and directors, as such, shall not contribute to or otherwise support or assist any political party or candidate for elective public office, nor advocate, sponsor, or promote legislation in the Congress of the United States or in the legislatures of the several States.

LIABILITY FOR ACTS OF OFFICERS AND AGENTS

SEC. 11. The corporation shall be liable for the acts of its officers and agents when acting within the scope of their authority.

PROHIBITION AGAINST ISSUANCE OF STOCK OR PAYMENT OF DIVIDENDS

SEC. 12. The corporation shall have no power to issue any shares of stock, nor to declare or pay any dividends, its objects and purposes being solely patriotic and educational.

BOOKS AND RECORDS; INSPECTION

SEC. 13. The corporation shall keep correct and complete books and records of account and shall also keep minutes of the proceedings of the annual conference, the board of directors, and committees having any authority under the board of directors; and it shall also keep at its principal office a record of the names and addresses of its members entitled to vote. All books and records of the corporation may be inspected by any member entitled to vote or his agent or attorney at any reasonable time.

AUDIT OF FINANCIAL TRANSACTIONS; REPORT TO COMPTROLLER GENERAL

SEC. 14. (a) The financial transactions shall be audited annually for the fiscal year ending June 30 of each year by an independent certified public accountant in accordance with the principles and procedures applicable to commercial corporate transactions, and under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States. The audit shall be conducted at the place or places where the accounts of the corporation are normally kept. All books, accounts, financial records, reports, files, and all other papers, things, or property belonging to or in use by the corporation and necessary to facilitate the audit shall be made available to the person or persons conducting the audit; and full facilities for verifying transactions with the balances or securities held by depositories, fiscal agents, and custodians shall be afforded to such person or persons.

(b) A report of such audit shall be filed annually with the Comptroller General in accordance with such regulations and upon such form as he shall prescribe verified by the certified public accountant by whom the audit is made.

USE OF ASSETS ON DISSOLUTION OR LIQUIDATION

SEC. 15. Upon final dissolution or liquidation of the corporation, and after the discharge or satisfaction of all outstanding obligations and liabilities, the remaining assets of the corporation shall be transferred by the board of directors to some recognized agency or agencies engaged in the furtherance and advancement of citizenship.

EXCLUSIVE RIGHT TO NAME, EMBLEMS, SEALS, AND BADGES

SEC. 16. The corporation shall have the sole and exclusive right to use the name, the National Conference on Citizenship, and such emblems, seals, and badges as the corporation may lawfully adopt.

RESERVATION OF RIGHT TO AMEND OR REPEAL CHARTER

SEC. 17. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING ACT OF JUNE 15, 1917, AS AMENDED

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 41) to further amend the act of June 15, 1917, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Reserving the right to object, is this the bill dealing with immigration?

Mr. HYDE. No, it is not. This is a different bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain what this bill is about?

Mr. HYDE. This is a Senate bill. It simplifies the procedure for the disposition of property being illegally exported. It brings it in line with the law providing the same use for imports. It is asked for by the Treasury Department.

Mr. RAYBURN. It is not Senate Concurrent Resolution 40?

Mr. HYDE. No, it is not.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of title VI of the act of June 15, 1917 (40 Stat. 233), as amended (U. S. C., 1945 ed., title 22, sec. 401), is further amended to read as follows:

"(a) Whenever an attempt is made to export or ship from or take out of the United States any arms or munitions of war or other articles in violation of law, or whenever it is known or there shall be probable cause to believe that any arms or munitions of war or other articles are intended to be or are being or have been exported or removed from the United States in violation of law, the Secretary of the Treasury, or any person duly authorized for the purpose by the President, may seize and detain such arms or munitions of war or other articles and may seize and detain any vessel, vehicle, or aircraft containing the same or which has been or is being used in exporting, or attempting to export such arms or munitions of war or other articles. All arms or munitions of war and other articles, vessels, vehicles, and aircraft seized pursuant to this subsection shall be forfeited.

"(b) All provisions of law relating to seizure, summary and judicial forfeiture and condemnation for violation of the customs laws, the disposition of the property, forfeited or condemned or the proceeds from the sale thereof; the remission or mitigation of such forfeitures; and the compromise of claims and the award of compensation to informers in respect of such forfeitures shall apply to seizures and forfeitures incurred, or alleged to have been incurred, under the provisions of this section, insofar as applicable and not inconsistent with the provisions hereof. Awards of compensation to informers under this section may be paid only out of funds specifically appropriated therefor.

"(c) Arms and munitions of war forfeited under subsection (b) of this section shall be delivered to the Secretary of Defense for such use or disposition as he may deem in the public interest, or, in the event that the Secretary of Defense refuses to accept such arms and munitions of war, they shall be sold or otherwise disposed of as prescribed under existing law in the case of forfeitures for violation of the customs laws."

SEC. 2. Sections 2, 3, 5, and 7 of the act of June 15, 1917 (ch. 30, title VI, 40 Stat. 224-225; U. S. C., 1946 ed., title 22, secs. 402, 403, 405, 407), and section 4 of such act, as amended by the act of March 1, 1929 (ch. 420, 45 Stat. 1423; U. S. C., 1946 ed., title 22, sec. 404), are repealed.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MEADER asked and was granted permission to address the House today for 15 minutes, following the legislative business of the day and any other special orders heretofore entered.

EXTENSION OF MEXICAN FARM LABOR PROGRAM

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 3480) to amend section 509 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, to extend for 3 years the period during which agricultural workers may be made available for employ-

ment under such title, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement on the part of the managers be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of July 31, 1953.)

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GRANTING STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 110) entitled "Concurrent resolution favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens," with Senate amendments, and concur in the amendments of the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 4, line 21, strike out "A-5772189" and insert "A-6772189."

Page 11, after line 5, insert:

"A-6501662, Berkowic, Mikulas."

Page 11, after line 5, insert:

"A-7053562, Denes, Emery (Imre)."

Page 11, after line 5, insert:

"A-7053561, Denes, Hedwig Alice."

Page 11, after line 5, insert:

"A-7415208, Denes, Istvan (Steven)."

Page 11, after line 5, insert:

"A-7415209, Denes, John."

Page 11, after line 5, insert:

"A-7415207, Denes, Marietta Catherine."

Page 11, after line 5, insert:

"A-7351567, Devay, Bela."

Page 11, after line 5, insert:

"A-7351568, Devay, Jeno."

Page 11, after line 5, insert:

"A-7351569, Devay, Laura."

Page 11, after line 5, insert:

"A-7351565, Devay, Livia."

Page 11, after line 5, insert:

"A-7351566, Devay, Marianne."

Page 11, after line 5, insert:

"A-7056844, Fisnar, Igor."

Page 11, after line 5, insert:

"A-7134270, Goldberg, Jankiel."

Page 11, after line 5, insert:

"A-7525881, Ho, Fiffille Yee Fang Sun."

Page 11, after line 5, insert:

"A-0923852, Ho, Nelson Hual Tsu."

Page 11, after line 5, insert:

"A-7267739, Mina, Abed Hanna."

Page 11, after line 5, insert:

"A-6903760, Morrissey, Suzanne Rath."

Page 11, after line 5, insert:

"A-6588565, Raby, Tawfik Meir."

Page 11, after line 5, insert:

"A-6851589, Tong, Robert Yuin-Peng."

Page 11, after line 5, insert:

"A-6739348, Wang, Bobby."

Page 11, after line 5, insert:

"A-6739355, Wang, Jeanett Kwang Chien."

Page 11, after line 5, insert:

"A-6739347, Wang, Paul."

Page 11, after line 5, insert:

"A-6739349, Wang, Peter."

Page 11, after line 5, insert:

"A-6450107, Wang, Te Chi C."

Page 11, after line 5, insert:

"A-7873138, Wu, Jun Fei or Jane Wu."

Page 11, after line 5, insert:

"A-7873131, Wu, Rowena Lee."

Page 11, after line 5, insert:

"A-7873130, Wu, Yi-Min."

Page 11, after line 5, insert:

"A-6847822, Yang, Meng-Chung alias James Meng-Chung Yang."

Page 11, after line 5, insert:

"A-7069212, Zehrer, Helen."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman whether that is a companion to Senate Concurrent Resolution 41.

Mr. GRAHAM. No.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. It has no relation to Senate Concurrent Resolution 41?

Mr. GRAHAM. No; it has not.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEVELOPMENT AND CONSTRUCTION OF WATER CONSERVATION FACILITIES

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 2094) to facilitate the development and construction of water conservation facilities by States and municipalities, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That in order to facilitate the development and construction by States and municipalities of water conservation facilities, certain requirements in the Federal Power Act are made inapplicable to States and municipalities as provided in this act.

SEC. 2. The words used in this act shall have the same meanings ascribed to them in the Federal Power Act.

SEC. 3. Section 14 of the Federal Power Act pertaining to the taking over by the United States of any project upon or after the expiration of a license, and sections 301 and 302 of said act requiring certain records and accounting procedures and section 4 (b) requiring the preparation and filing of the statement of actual legitimate original cost of a project, shall not be applicable to any project owned by a State or a municipality, and such rights and requirements shall not exist under any license heretofore or hereafter granted to any State or municipality, except that the provisions of section 14 and section 4 (b) shall continue to be applicable to any license issued for a hydroelectric development in the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence River.

The Federal Power Commission in determining the amount of annual charges applicable to any such project may determine the annual charges with reference to the actual cost of services incurred by the Commission with respect to the project.

SEC. 4. Except as herein provided, the provisions of this act shall not be construed as repealing or affecting any of the provisions of the Federal Power Act.



Public Law 237 - 83d Congress
Chapter 391 - 1st Session
H. R. 3480

AN ACT

All 67 Stat. 500.

To amend section 509 of title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, to extend for two years the period during which agricultural workers may be made available for employment under such title.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 509 of Agricultural title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by ^{workers.} striking out "December 31, 1953" and inserting in lieu thereof ^{65 Stat. 121.} "December 31, 1955".

Approved August 8, 1953.

